All Letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer, though not necessarily for publication.
Where difficulty is experienced in procuring the Journal with regularity in the Provinces, it is requested that application be made direct to the Publisher.

The Solicitors' Journal.

LONDON, MARCH 4, 1865.

THE ARGUMENTS by which, in the interest of equity jurisprudence, this Journal ventured * to impugn the decision of the Master of the Rolls, in Lechmere v Brotheridge, 11 W. R. 841, that a conveyance by a married woman of her separate equitable estate in fee requires her acknowledgment, under the Fines and Recoveries Abolition Act, have proved to be well founded. For the arguments in question, which were of some length, we beg leave to refer to the volume and places quoted, only noting here that our attention was principally directed against three positions on which the judgment at the Rolls rested. lst, that separate use was meant only to bar the interests of the husband. 2nd, that a married woman, at common law, had in her fee simple any estate separate from her husband's estate. 3rd, that in an equitable separate estate to a married woman and her heirs, the word heirs implied any interest to be protected in favour of any one against the married woman's disposition of the fee. One of the articles in question concluded with the remark that it would be "extraordinary if a court of competent jurisdiction did not ultimately decide the question in accordance with the dictum of Lord Justice Turner in Atchison v. Le Mann (August, 1854). 'It being settled that an estate in fee may be limited to the separate use of a married woman, thus giving her an absolute ownership, she must, I think, have all the rights of ownership which are incident to that ownership," and the conclusion of the other was

even more pointedly to a similar effect.

Lord Chancellor Brady, in a case mentioned in our former article, arrived at the opinion, from a long series of cases, and from the text books, that the question of a married woman's disposition of her separate estate in fee could be satisfactorily determined by the House of Lords could be satisfactorily determined by the House of Lords only. But probably the judgment of Lord Westbury in Taylor v. Meads, 13 W. R. 394, agreeing as it does with the opinion of the Lord Justice, will be regarded as conclusive. The case came before the Lord Chancellor on appeal from a decision of the Master of the Rolls (12 W. R. 846), as to the validity of a will executed, according to the statute, by a married woman who was empowered to appoint by "any instrument in writing, to be by her signed, sealed, and delivered, in writing, to be by her signed, sealed, and delivered, in the presence of, and attested by two or more credible witnesses," where the property was limited in default of

appointment to her for her separate use.

In the argument on the appeal a point was raised, whether, when real estate was devised to trustees for the separate use of a married woman and her heirs, she had the same power over her equitable estate in fee as if she were a feme sole. Having decided the question of the validity of the will, in respect of the express power, the Lord Chancellor said there arose the question, which had not been decided in the court below, whether a married woman, during her coverture, could devise an equitable estate held in trust for her and her heirs, for her separate use, by a will executed in conformity with the statute. He was of opinion that with respect to separate property, the feme covert was, by the form of trust, freed from the disability of coverture, and invested with the rights and powers of a person who was sai juris. It would be contrary to the doctrine of courts of equity respecting the rights of married women, to hold

that it was necessary for a wife to have the assent of her husband before dealing with an estate conveyed to her separate use. Everything in dealing with such an estate lay between the married woman and her trustees, and, therefore, any instrument that was signed by her operated as a direction to the trustees to deal with such separate estate according to the new trust created by such direction. He must hold that a feme covert, when not restrained from alienation, had as incident to her separate use, a complete right to alienate by any instrument, inter vivos or by will.

MATTHEW DOBSON LOWNDES, Esq., whose decease it was our melancholy duty to record on the 18th ult.,* was one of those men of mark who

"Departing, leave behind them "Footprints in the sands of Time:"

and it will probably be long before the place he has left vacant in professional society in Liverpool will be

filled up.

Mr. Lowndes was the grandson of Dr. Dobson, a Liverpool physician of eminence, and, upon his own entry into active life, he made that town the scene of his exertions. He served his time at Altrincham, in Cheshire, and, when quite a young man, entered into partnership in Liverpool with Mr. Bulmer, under the firm of Bulmer & Lowndes; but this partnership was of short duration, and he began business on his own account. This was, under the circumstances, an ambitious and somewhat hazardous step, for the young lawyer was then almost without professional connexion in Liverpool, but Mr. Lowndes was no ordinary man, and his career is one which may serve as an encouragement to young men of talent and industry who may consider that they do not all at once make such rapid progress as they fancy is due to their abilities. He used often tell how, for some time after he began business on own account, he spent hours in playing chess in his office, waiting for clients, who came not; and yet, when once his abilities began to be known, his progress upward was most rapid, and in a few years his name became familiar as that of one of the ablest commercial lawyers in Liverpool—we might almost say in England. His memory for decided cases was most wonderful, for he could not only recollect the names of the parties, but could tell the volume, and, in not a few instances, the very page in the volume where any particular principle of law which he wished to quote had been laid down.

After his business had been established, he took the late Mr. James Robinson (who had been articled to him) into partnership; and for many years the firm of Lowndes & Robinson stood second to none in Liverpool. Both members were men of the highest character, not only for ability, but also for that almost more valuable quality in a confidential adviser, the strong feeling that, apart from technicalities, right should be done. In 1842 apart from technicanties, right should be firm was that of Lowndes, Robinson, & Bateson, until the year last and Lowndes, Robinson retired from business. The vacancy thus created in the firm was filled up by the admittance of Mr. Lowndes's son (the present representative of the firm), and the new firm of Lowndes, Bateson, & Lowndes, soon became as well known, both in Liverpool and London, as either of its predecessors

had been before it.

About four years ago Mr. Lowndes determined on retiring from business, in consequence, in great part, of threatened paralysis of the tongue, which tended to affect his speech, and since that time he has lived in the retirement of his family circle, in the enjoyment of those domestic comforts which he had so well earned by a life of useful and honourable toil. At this time the firm of Lowndes, Bateson, and Lowndes was dissolved, but its business, or the principal part thereof, was continued by Mr. Lowndes's three sons, who, in connection with Mr. Paget, formed themselves into the * 9 Sol. Jour. 336.

present partnership which practises in Liverpool under the firm of Lowndes and Co., and in London under that of Lowndes and Sons. At the same time Mr. Bateson entered into partnership with Mr. John Robinson (nephew of the said James Robinson), and the firm of Bateson and Robinson is also at this moment one of the

leading firms in Liverpool.

Like many professional men in large practice, Mr. Lowndes injured his health by incessant application to business. For many years a fortnight's holiday in the twelve months was all that he allowed himself. He not only worked at the office for seven or eight hours a day, but scarcely an evening passed that he did not read papers and write or dictate in his study at home. wonder, then, that his health should give way. His friends, however, date the commencement of his illness from his having been in the express train which ran off the line at Roby some few years since, when the engineer and stoker were killed. This accident gave a great shock to Mr. Lowndes' nervous system, and he never thoroughly recovered from the effects.

Mr. Lowndes was not a mere lawyer, but was a most engaging companion, his mind being well stored with general literature, and especially in a thorough know-ledge of the older poets, from whom he was most apt in his quotations. He leaves behind him a widow, five sons, and several daughters to mourn the loss of a most

indulgent husband and father.

LORD DEAS often surprises, and sometimes amuses, the profession in this country as well as in Scotland, by his legal idiosyncracy. His ingenuity, however unexpected, and at times comical, as it certainly is, does not always lead him astray. But he has staggered us with his notions of conjugal sympathy! In the Scotsman of the 22nd inst., there is a short report of the case of Paton v. Craig, in which it was alleged that the plaintiff, a married lady, had been induced to execute an assignment in consequence of a threat by the defendant of the "immediate incarceration of her husband." The Court, we are told, refused to allow an issue, by which, we suppose, is meant that they held that the action was not maintainable, and we are willing to believe they were right on the facts, although the case really looks as if it would have been better to have allowed it to be tried. Lord Deas, however, enforced the opinion of the Court, and at the same time enlivened the proceedings, by observing that the incarceration of the husband was often the best thing that could happen to a wife!!!

THE FIRST MONTHLY NUMBER of a new series of a legal periodical in one of the British American colonies, the Upper Canada Law Journal, published at Toronto, has appeared. It is conducted by W. D. Ardagh, Barrister-at-Law, Robert A. Harrison, B.C.L., Barrister-at-Law, and Henry O'Brien, Barrister-at-Law. The number is in octavo, in double column, and contains twenty-eight pages, besides a wrapper of advertisements and table of contents. The first division of the advertise-ments is headed "Professional advertisements," and begins rather strangely, according to home notions— "Paterson, Harrison, & Paterson, Barristers, Attorneys, Solicitors in Chancery, &c. Chancery department under the superintendence of Mr. J. Paterson." Their place of business is then announced, and their names are signed. Twelve advertisements of "barristers, attorneys, &c.," follow, and there are three of "Solicitors in Chancery, Conveyancers, &c." After miscellaneous legal advertisements, comes one of Blackstone's Commentaries adapted to the law in Upper Canada, with an N.B., "copies supplied for cash only." Cash at Toronto seems to be ready, for there is a pleasant list of "Remittances," numerous, ranging from 3 dols. 60c. to 10 dols. Judging from the advertisement sheet we should think that there must be no inconsiderable publication of Upper Canadian law books.

The adoption by barristers of this commercial means

of publicity will not appear to be so dreadfully out of etiquette, when our readers remember the notice in this Journal* of the practice of the legal profession at Toronto. Speaking of the Law Society there, which is like one of the English Inns of court, it was observed, in the notice, that the Toronto attorneys were not members of the society unless they were also members of the bar; but nearly all were both. There were only a few men who were barristers and not attorneys, and those came from England. But if the attorney, being a barrister, advertises as both, yet it is not explained why the attorneys themselves should advertise. Very likely there is a good reason for it. Our Canadian brother will perhaps throw some light upon the point in an

early number.

The matter of the inner sheets of the Journal consists of reports of cases and proceedings in the Toronto Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, Common Law Chambers, Chancery Chambers, and Recorder's Court. The outer chancery Chambers, and Recorder's Court. The outer sheets are the journalistic part, in the manner of the Jurist, except that the Canadian periodical has omitted, from inadvertence or otherwise, to separate the paging of the reports from that of the rest of the number. There is, in the number, a "leader" of ample length on "Our Neutrality." It urges the duty of impartiality in a neutral nation as the shief of its obligations towards the neutral nation, as the chief of its obligations towards the belligerents, noticing the British Foreign Enlistment Act as a step in advance of other European states to prevent the citizen from taking part in a foreign war, and the legislation in this country, by thirteen Acts, from the 33 Geo. 3, c. 4, to the 10 & 11 Vict. c. 20, to give to the Government a proper control over aliens, as occasion may require. It was a power which, according to Canning, had undoubtedly been exercised by the Crown, sometimes without the assent of Parliament. The joursometimes without the assent of Parlament. The jour-nal considers that some Act for the removal of aliens is needed in Canada. "There are men," says the article, "living in our midst, who, it is well known, are here for no good. They are crafty, but their purpose and business are known. Evidence, it is true, cannot at present be had to lead to their conviction on a criminal charge, but there is no more doubt of their guilt." However, the Journal refuses to accede to the right claimed by General Dix, on the authority of an un-guarded passage in Phillimore, to cross the boundary into the neutral state for the capture of "rebels." article proceeds to discuss the case of M'Cleod, the British subject in command of the Canadian expedition which seized the United States vessel, the Caroline, in the States waters, and sent her over the Falls, when she was supposed to be destined to aid the Canadian rebels in December, 1837. For this he was apprehended in the States. The British Government demanded his imme-The States refused it, and would not diate release. recognise his defence, that he was acting under Government orders, as valid in the States jurisdiction. For-tunately he proved an alibi, and was acquitted. On that occasion, Daniel Webster limited the belligerent right of invading neutral territory to cases of "clear and absolute" necessity - "a necessity for self defence, instant and overwhelming, leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation." The Journal asks the United States to have confidence in the Canadians, and not to lend a ready ear to those whose business it is to embroil Great Britain and the United States. discharge of the St. Alban's raiders was a hasty act, and one which all right-thinking men deplored;" but the Government repudiated it, and re-arrested the raiders. Burley, the Lake Eric pirate, had been committed for extradition, and the decision had since been sustained by four judges of the superior courts. "This action of our Government," writes the Journal, in conclusion, "receives the hearty support of the entire body of our people, who are influenced not merely by motives of self-interest, but of impartiality and right as between the contending parties across the lines.'

^{* 7} Sol. Jour. 917.

In type and material qualities, the Toronto publication is not quite equal to the London legal periodicals. But it is not much behind them. Certainly, it bears out our observations on the former occasion on the very respectable intellectual position of the lawyers in Upper Canada.

THE TABLES OF PREMIUMS to be charged under contracts for the insurance of lives or the grant of Government annuities, according to the Acts 16 & 17 Vict. c. 45, and 27 & 28 Vict. c. 43, were issued last week. Under the powers vested in the Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury by the 6th section of the latter Act, they are to approve the tables, and lay them before both Houses of Parliament for thirty days before they shall be acted upon. The tables now issued are divided into three parts, and consist of, first, tables for the insurance of ordinary lives; second, deferred life annuities; and third, immediate life annuities. In the two latter cases the money is not to be returnable under any circumstances. With respect to the former, the tables for fixing the surrender value of or sum to be returned on a policy of insurance are still under consideration; because, by the 8th section of the Act of last session, no policy will have a surrender value until premiums shall have been paid under it for five years; that is, not before the year 1870. Other tables are still under consideration, and will, in time, be submitted to Parliament. We are inclined to think that the want of the tables fixing the surrender value of a policy will have the effect of keeping back insurers, who would prefer to know what will be the value in five years' time of a policy effected now. This is an omission which the Treasury should amend at once.

Comparing the tables now issued with those of the leading life assurance companies, we find the Government premiums are slightly higher in amount, and there is, therefore, every reason to expect that those cases which come within the ordinary business of an assurance company will not be taken to the Government. In fact, we believe that these tables are eminently calculated to carry out the intention of the Legislature, which is to give a secure investment for small sums without interfering with private enterprise. Every facility is given for the payment of premiums in numerous ways—either in one sum, or in an annual sum, or by small monthly instalments, and, in fact, in every way which will be suitable for the class for whom it is chiefly intended—namely, the members of friendly societies and benefit clubs.

At the late meeting of the Juridical Society, held under the chairmanship of Lord Stanley, Mr. Edward Webster read a paper advocating the entire abolition of capital punishment. This opinion was ably supported by the Hon. D. Campbell, who was followed in the same direction by Mr. Francis Worsley and Mr. William Tallack, and combatted Mr. W. M. Best. Lord Stanley expressed his conviction that the theological defence of capital punishment had "entirely fallen through." He was certain that the subject would meet with a thoroughly impartial treatment, both by the Royal Commission now sitting to consider the laws of capital punishment, and also by Parliament after the issue of the report of that commission. Mr. Tallack stated that in America and Germany murderers were punished by secondary penalties, found, in practice, to be satisfactory and secure. He also alluded to the perfect security and absolute permanency of the confinement at Broadmoor of about 500 of our lunatic murderers, the most dangerous class of any.

We can of course sympathize with the difficulty in which the noble chairman found himself placed when asked to express himself, at a meeting of this kind, in a manner sure to be taken as an indication of his action as a member of the commission on the subject, and we feel that, whatever may have been his personal opinion, nothing could have been expected from him more definite than what he said. This does not apply, however,

to other speakers, and we are somewhat surprised that the existing law found no direct supporter other than Mr. Best. We say no direct supporter, for we do not ask stronger advocacy for the retention of capital punishment in cases of murder than was supplied by the speech of Mr. Tallack. If the state of things in America be a specimen of the results of verdicts of "murder in the second degree," and that, even though death is still retained for cases of murder in the first degree (a verdict seldom found), we have no desire to use their experience otherwise than as an example "fædum inceptu, fædum exitu, quod vites." We have no wish to find ladies, required to go alone along the Edgware-road, compelled to carry revolvers for their protection; we have no wish to find melées, like that at Saffron-hill, the rule of our hotels, with the extra element of a free use of firearms; we have no desire to encourage amongst our population that recklessness of the life of others which immunity from the penalty of death seems to bring in its train.

THE METROPOLITAN HOUSELESS POOR ACT, 27 & 28 Vict. c. 116, does not prove to be such a success as we, though not among its most sanguine supporters, had hoped.* Official apathy has not suffered poor law guardians to enter with spirit upon the new ground opened up for them, and we believe the result of the return which has been moved for in Parliament will be to show that but very few of the metropolitan parishes have done more for the poor since than previously to the passing of the Act. It certainly was an experiment, and as such, its failure has been notorious. only has more money been collected by private societies, and more persons relieved through those channels than before, but although a greater number of houseless poor have been actually relieved in the metropolitan workhouses, yet there has been more destitution in the streets, and more general complaints that the poor are refused admission to the casual wards, and left to wander about or die there, than ever. We believe that very few of those parishes which have relieved casual poor under this Act, and probably none, have done their duty by providing for the relief of this winter's distress, which, however, we admit to have been exceptionably aggravated. It is clear that a strong expression of public opinion is wanting to make the parish authorities do their duty in this matter. In a month the Act will expire. If its execution did not consist so much in details, and therefore leave so much in the discretion of the local authorities, we should have some hope that it might, after another year of probation, yet prove more successful; but unless some official were appointed by the Board of Works at each union, whose business it should be to provide shelter for every applicant, we do not see any mode (beyond the expression of public opinion) of enforcing its operation. If only a proper expression of that opinion could be elicited, we would be enabled to say with confidence what we now say scarcely with hope-"Let the guardians look to it, and perform their duty in this respect, lest the administration of their own funds be taken away from them and lodged in some more efficient administrative body.

The renewed agitation in the great Matlock Will case has come, we presume, to a termination. Our readers will remember the circumstances of this case, and how Mr. Else discovered codicil after codicil, each giving him something more than the one before, till the suspicions of the deprived legatees under the will were aroused, and, after three trials, the codicils were finally upset, and the will established by a decree of the Master of the Rolls, dated June 1, 1864.

Last Michaelmas Term Mr. Karslake applied to his

Last Michaelmas Term Mr. Karslake applied to his Honour for leave to file a bill of review, on the ground that, on the 13th May, 1864, certain documents, alleged to be in Mr. Nuttal's (the testator's) handwriting, which tended to prove the genuine character of the

* 8 Sol. Jour. 940.

disputed documents, had been discovered in an old bed-

stead which had belonged to the testator.

The Master of the Rolls refused the motion with costs, on the ground that the genuineness of the new documents was, at least, as doubtful as that of the codicils themselves; and he refused to allow the later papers to be submitted to the investigation of experts, on the ground, suggested (if he will allow us to say so) by the soundest common sense, that Else, who was, in effect, proved by the last verdict to have forged the codicils, would, if he were also the forger of the new documents, have had the advantage of knowing the points of difference by which his former attempt had been discovered and frustrated, and the opportunity of providing against their recurrence.

From this judgment Else appealed, and the appeal was argued at great length and with all the proverbial skill and power of the Attorney-General, before the Lord Chancellor. His Lordship, on Saturday, delivered judgment, refusing the application with costs, on the technical ground that the documents which are relied on had been discovered in sufficient time to have been made the subject of a motion in arrest of the judgment in the former suit, and that, therefore, the applicant had been entirely former suit, and that, therefore, the applicant had been entirely former suit, and that, therefore, the applicant had been entirely former suit, and that, therefore, the applicant had been entirely former suits of inverseable delay.

plicant had been guilty of inexcusable delay.

At the same time his Lordship remarked—

That he did not base his order in any feeling of obligation to put an end to further proceedings. If he could have disposed of the case on its merits, he would have approached it with the knowledge that Else had been in a manner found to have committed perjury and forgery, and if the difficulties about the lateness of the application had been got over, and the documents had stood the test of an examination by experts, he would have been inclined to accede to this application. He said this extra-judicially, because he did not wish it to be understood as if he had escaped on a technical ground from considering the case.

We trust that the public will hear no more of a matter on the merits of which there can scarcely be two

unbiassed opinions.

The question whether the late change in the law affecting juries has, on the whole, been beneficial (upon which grave doubts have been not altogether unreasonably entertained) received a curious illustration on Saturday last.

On Friday the case of Sassoon and Another v. Hall and Others came on for trial in the Court of Common Pleas, before a special jury, who were locked up about two o'clock, and ultimately discharged without a verdict.

We read in Saturday morning's papers that-

The Lord Chief Justice said this morning he had received a remonstrance from the jury who were discharged at ten o'clock last night, stating that at four o'clock they were divided in opinions in the proportions of eleven to one, and and that they were at that hour certain that neither party would change sides. He believed that if gentlemen of the jury, instead of making up their minds that they never would change their side after they had once chosen it, would, with an earnest desire to get at the truth, communicate one with another, they would then get rid of what he might call a matter of feeling, though, of course, gentlemen desired to do their duty. The jury said that they were perfectly certain at four that neither side would change, and that there was no use in the judge keeping them until ten; but he begged most humbly to differ from them, and must say that if the jury would only join in discussion with some mutual trust in each other, the result would in general be a verdict.

We have never been insensible to the just demands of jurors; our pages have always been open for the ventilation of their complaints, and we cannot therefore lie fairly under any imputation of unfriendliness if we say that the state of things disclosed by this remonstrance leads us to the question whether jurors ought to be permitted to feel that they had nothing to do but to refuse all consideration of the matter before them, and sit down doggedly to wait for the moment of their discharge. A jury discharged without a verdict is a grievous loss to the parties, a serious injury to the course of

justice, and, though it is illogical, and in a certain sense absurd, to coerce a jury to agree, whether their consciences approve of the verdict or not, it is by no means clear that this is not a lesser evil than that produced by the enormously increasing frequency of final disagreement.

We should be strongly inclined to require a jury who could not agree to remain locked up for not less than twelve hours (of course not without food, fire, &c., as on the old barbarous system), and, even then, to show, before being entitled to their discharge, that the whole question had been fully, patiently, and repeatedly discussed between them without effect.

cussed between them without elect.

Whatever may be the rights of the unhappy quarrel which for the last four years has distracted the United States, there can be no doubt that it is resulting in a great social revolution, in which every true lover of freedom and justice, whatever his opinions may be on other questions, ought to rejoice.

Whether the war end in union or separation, in free soil or the permanence of slavery in the South, it is clearly emancipating the free negroes of the North from that social ban, almost as hard as slavery itself, under

which they have so long laboured.

As an instance of this emancipation, we may adduce the following extract from the New York Times:—

Through the door that was too narrow freely to let out the bearers that bore Charles Sumner's inanimate form from the Senate Chamber, where he had been stricken down by the assassins of the slave power, Charles Sumner to-day marched back, leading a negro by the hand, and, standing upon the very spot that had been stained with his blood for demanding freedom and equality for the blacks in America, demanded of the Supreme Court of the United States to enroll among its members an African lawyer, and to license him to practice at its bar. The black man was admitted. Jet black, with no palliation of complexion, no abatement whatever in any particular from the despised standard of hu-manity, brutally set up in our politics and in our ju-dicatory by the Dred Scott decision, this inky-hued African stood within the bar of the court which had solemnly pronounced that black men had no rights which white men were bound to respect, stood there a recognised member of it, professionally the brother of the distinguished counsellors on its long rolls, in rights their equal -in the standing which rank gives their peer! The sight was dramatic. At three minutes before eleven o'clock in the dramate. At three minutes before eleven occock in the morning, Charles Sumner entered the court-room, followed by the negro applicant for admission, and sat down within the bar. At eleven o'clock the procession of gowned judges entered the room with Chief Justice Chase at their head. The spectators and the lawyers in attendance rose respectfully on their coming. The associate-justices seated themselves nearly at once, as is their courteous custom of waiting upon each other's movements. The Chief Justice standing to the last, bowed with affable dignity to the bar, and took his central seat with a great presence. Immediately the senator from Massachusetts arose, and in composed manner and quiet tone, said, "May it please the Court, I move that John S. Rock, a member of the Supreme Court of the State of Massachusetts, be admitted to practice as a member of this Court." The grave to bury the Dred-Scott decision was in that one sentence dug, and it yawned there, wide open, under the very eyes of some of the judges who had participated in the juridical crime against humanity. The assenting nod of the great head of the Chief Justice tumbled in the corpse and filled up the pit, and the black counsellor of the Supreme Court got on to it and stamped it down, and smoothed the earth to his walk to the rolls of the court.

A few lawyers of the old regime looked on, stunned somewhat, but rapidly growing in wisdom and mixing deference to destiny with their instinctive reluctance to this revolutionary intrusion. The clerk of the court, especially appointed by Taney's urgency and vote, was constrained to propriety of manner, while swearing in the first negro lawyer upon the rolls in his custody. His face, however, was set hard, and his soul evidently longed for the resurrection of his old chief, Taney, and the palmy slave-driving days of the Attorney-generalship of Black. But they are all

gone, and the revolution which is washing off the continent slavery, aristocracy, caste, and privilege, came up with Salmon P. Chase into the Supreme Court of the United States, and is already enthroned in the seat of its chief justice, and in the chairs of the lawyers who argue at its bar.

The incident, though note-worthy in itself, (for the Supreme Court at Washington is constitutionally neutral ground for slave-holder and free-soiler alike,) is yet more important from the tone taken by the party now in the ascendant in the Northern States.

Five years ago the bar of Massachussets would have resented as an indignity the admission of a negro (or a white man, as white as any of themselves, of whom it was known that his great-great-grandmother had been a negress) to practice amongst them; no one would have held a brief along with him, no white man would have entrusted him with the conduct of a case; now they not only welcome this negro to their own body, but send him to the capital to stand amongst the representatives of their State at the bar of the Supreme Court of Appeal.

And this is not mere matter of form. The admission of a provincial lawyer to practice in the Supreme Court is the highest non-judicial promotion in the profession which the bar in America offers to its members, and is somewhat analogous to the degree of the coif here, or, rather, to what the degree of the coif would be if the new serieants were elected by their respective circuits, instead of being appointed as is at present the case. The local bars are very careful in opposing the admission to the Supreme Court of any of their members whom they think unlikely to do them credit, and they can, in fact, always prevent such admission if they please, because no provincial lawyer is admitted except on the motion of a counsellor of the court, who must also be a member of the same State bar as the applicant.

That any body of white men in New England should treat a "nigger" as not merely personally free, not merely—what, by the bye, he is not in any State except Maine—politically their peer, but as socially their equal; and that a leading New York paper should exult in the fact; are marvellous signs of a revolution of feeling so rapid and complete as to be without precedent in the

history of the world.

THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS, having exhausted his list of causes, held no court on Tuesday last. The absence of the "law's delays" in this court will be seen when we say that one day last week his Honour rose for the day at half-past eleven a.m., having disposed of no less than twelve causes.

WE ARE INFORMED that James Fleming, Esq., Q.C. has been appointed Chief Commissioner, and Reginald John Cust, Esq., of the Equity Bar, Assistant Commissioner, of the West Indian Incumbered Estates Court, in the room of Mr. Stonor and Sir Frederic Rogers, Bart., of whom the former has been appointed Judge of the Surrey County Courts, and the latter has retired, being fully occupied by his duties as Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies.

Mr. Fleming has been long well known to the profession and the public from his connection with most, if not all the leading peerage cases which have occurred in recent times. Mr. Cust has been the secretary of the Commission since 1857, and is the author of a treatise on the Incumbered Estates Acts, which has recently reached a second edition, and which we had the pleasure of reviewing in our number of the 11th ult.* His name is also well known to most of our readers as one of the reporters on the staff of the Weekly Reporter, in which capacity he has acted for several years in the Court of Appeal in Chancery.

WE ARE GLAD to learn that the venerable judge of of the Court of Admiralty has so far recovered from his late indisposition as to resume his sittings in court.

THE IRISH BAR have adopted a series of rules for

• 9 Sol. Jour. 365.

their future guidance. They are devoted to a rule to prevent Queen's counsel from signing pleadings without the concurrence of a junior, and to a number of minute regulations on the "Law of Retainer." These rules and regulations are so precisely those which have governed the Bar of this country from time "whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary," that we do not think it necessary to report them here; and can only express our wonder that the profession in Ireland could have got into such a state as to render their formal enactment and promulgation necessary.

EVIDENCE OF CHARACTER.

The case of The Queen v. James Rowton, 13 W. R. 436, decided on the 29th of January by a large majority of the judges, affords a conspicuous example of one of the most marked, and, philosophically considered, one of the most objectionable, characteristics of English law: which, however beneficial in ordinary practice, and we are not disposed to dispute that it is so, sometimes, as in the instance before us, leads to results the most absurd.

In the administration of our law, practice almost always precedes principle—the rule is collected from a multitude of instances, instead of the instances being applications of the rule-and a right may be continually exercised for an indefinite period, and yet its limits remain undetermined, and incapable of being determined, until a case happens to arise in which it is necessary to define them. For at least two centuries, and probably much longer, prisoners on their trial have been allowed to call witnesses to speak to their previous good character; every criminal court in the kingdom has received such evidence over and over again; yet it was reserved for her Majesty's judges, in this year of grace, eighteen hundred and sixty-five, to determine the nature and extent of the evidence so admissible. It has always been laid down in the text-books that a prisoner may produce evidence of his general good character, and that, if he do so, the prosecutor may then give rebutting evidence of bad character; but the first of these propositions contains an ambiguity, the second was, until the other day, unsupported by authority; and the task of the judges, in the case referred to, was to explain the one proposition, and to affirm or reject the other. Upon the second point all the judges present, with the exception of Baron Martin, were unanimous in holding that, whenever evidence of character has been called on behalf of a prisoner, similar evidence may be adduced on the other side to rebut it; and, although Baron Martin entertained doubts, it is difficult to see how any other conclusion than that of the majority could have been arrived at consistently with the ordinary principles of evidence. But, upon the other question before the Court, there was more difference of opinion.

We have said that the rule in the books is ambiguous, and the ambiguity lies in the word "character." A man's character sometimes means his disposition-the actual qualities of mind which distinguish him; sometimes it means his reputation-the impression which those qualities have made upon the people among whom he lives. In which of these senses are we to understand the statement that evidence of character is admissible in criminal cases? The question arose in The Queen v. James Rowton in the following way:- The prisoner was accused of an indecent assault, and called witnesses to character, and, in reply, a witness was called who said-"I know nothing of the opinion of the neighburhood, because I was a boy at school at the time I knew him, but my opinion, and that of my brothers, who were also his pupils, was, that his character was that of a man capable of the grossest indecency and immorality." And the Lord Chief Justice, delivering the judgment of the majority of the Court, held that this answer ought not to have gone to the jury, inasmuch as it professed to give the witness's own judgment of the prisoner's disposition, and not his general reputation, evidence of character being evidence of reputation, and nothing else. From this decision there were only two dissentients; but sententiæ ponderantur non numerantur, and there can be no presumption in freely discussing the reasons and consequences of a judgment from which Lord Chief Justice Erle and Mr. Justice Willes deliberately differed.

As to the reason and object of admitting evidence of character there is no difference of opinion. The question which the jury have to answer in every case is, whether the prisoner is or is not guilty of a particular offence; and as bearing upon this question, the accused is allowed to show that he is an unlikely person, from his character and antecedents, to commit such a crime, and to ask the jury to conclude that it is more likely that the witnesses against him are perjured or deceived, more likely that there is some mistake about the matter, than that such a person should be guilty of the offence with which he is charged. It is for this reason, because the evidence goes to the question of guilty or not guilty, that it must have some relation to the nature of the crime charged; if the crime charged be theft, the evidence must be of honesty, if treason, of loyalty; and for the same reason, as well as for others, the evidence must be of general character, not of particular facts, particular facts being often little or no indication of a man's true nature. From the same considerations it is plain that the important thing to be arrived at in estimating the probability of guilt is the disposition and qualities of the accused; the difference of opinion is as to the means of arriving at this. The minority of the judges thought that you might call witnesses and question them directly on the subject, and that they might answer "We have known the accused and had opportunities of observation, and we believe him to be an honest man, a humane man, a careful man," or as the case may be. The majority held such evidence inadmissible; they held that the witnesses could only say, "He is reputed an honest man or a careful man; he bears a good character for humanity or loyalty." Their view is that expressed in Lord Erskine's eloquent words, "Character is the slow spreading influence of opinion arising from the deportment of a man in society; as a man's deportment, good or bad, necessarily produces one circle without another, and so extends itself till it unites in one general opinion, that general opinion is allowed to be given in evidence.

Now, in forming a judgment upon a question of this kind, three things may reasonably be considered; first, the general principles of law applicable to the subject; secondly, authority; and thirdly, convenience and common And, in the first place, it being admitted that what the jury want to know is the disposition of the accused, it being admitted that this can only be known from the opinions, either of individuals or of large numbers of people, it is impossible to imagine any intelligible principle which should exclude direct evidence in favour of more remote and indirect, and forbid a witness to tell what he himself thinks of the prisoner, while it allows him to tell what an indefinite number of other people think. And, in fact, the Lord Chief Justice does not rest his judgment upon any principle, but expressly disclaims doing so. He seems to rely upon the absence of authority for the other view, and upon a supposed general concurrence of opinion to the effect that character means reputation. Upon this it seems not unfair to remark, and it is implied in the judgment of Chief Justice Erle, that the onus of producing authority lies rather upon those who deny the admissibility of direct evidence than upon those who assert it. But, moreover, it appears to us that the case is by no means destitute of authority. We believe that a series of cases, extending over a very long period, may be produced, in which witnesses have been allowed to state indiscriminately their own opinion of the prisoner's disposition, and his general reputation; and the evidence has in some of those cases been received by judges who had, at least, no undue leaning in favour of the accused, and with the tacit assent of counsel, who were astute to detect any

defect in his evidence. In the trial of Colonel Turner for burglary, in 1664 (6 St. Tr. 565), Chief Justice Hyde allowed witnesses to come and state their own experience of the prisoner's honesty. In the trial of Swandsen for abduction, in 1702 (14 St. Tr. 559), Chief Justice Holt asked the witnesses-"What do you know of Mr. Swandsen?" And in reply they stated both their own knowledge and judgment, and his general reputation. Treason cases are unsatisfactory authorities upon this question, for in a case of treason, as of other crimes in which the intent is material, it is not always easy to distinguish between evidence bearing upon the intent, and evidence of character. For this reason we pass by the cases of Lord Russell, Mr. Hampden, Dammaree, and others, though, in spite of Erskine's elaborate argument to the contrary, during Hardy's trial, we believe that much of the evidence in those cases was strictly evidence of character. But there is one treason case about which no doubt can exist. Upon the trial of O'Coighly and others for treason, before Justices Buller, Heath, and Lawrence, at Maidstone, in 1798 (27 St. Tr. 1), Erskine, Fox, Lord Suffolk and many others were called on behalf of Arthur O'Connor, one of the accused. These witnesses were asked one after another, to state their personal knowledge and belief as to O'Connor's disposition; and they stated that they believed him to be a man of the strictest honour and integrity, incapable of dissimulation, of a frank and open disposition, and so on; and this evidence was left to the jury expressly as evidence of character. We shall cite only one other authority, but it is one very closely in point. Alexander Davison was tried in 1808 for frauds upon a public department, and he called Lord Moira, and several others, as witnesses to character; some of their evidence was objected to and excluded as too particular, and Lord Ellenborough, the presiding judge, himself put to the witnesses this question-" From your knowledge of Mr. Davison's character, do you think him capable of committing a fraud?" (31 St. Tr. 189.) This authority is the more remarkable because the question was not hastily or inadvertently allowed, but was deliberately framed and put by Lord Ellenborough himself; and it is identical in terms with the evidence now decided to be inadmissible. In addition to these authorities, we will only appeal to the testimony of Chief Justice Erle; who says that he never knew a witness examined as to character without an inquiry into his personal means of knowledge, and to the observation and experience of such of our readers as are familiar with criminal trials; and we believe we are justified in thinking that the recent decision has made an important change in the law of evidence, and must, if acted upon, be followed by a corresponding change in the practical administration of justice.

This brings us to the remaining aspect of the question, and what has now become by far its most important aspect, that is to say, the convenience and utility of the rule as laid down by the judges; and this deserves serious consideration. The law as now established seems to be, that the only evidence of character admissible either for or against a prisoner is evidence of reputation. Now there are no doubt cases in which a man's general reputation is of much value as an index of his real character; but they are only cases in which the accused person occupies such a position that his conduct and deportment fall under the eye of some considerable number of people, and in which also the quality brought into question is one upon which people have some reason for forming an opinion. In the case of a shopkeeper accused of theft, his manner of trading has been before the public, his customers and neighbours are sure to have formed some opinion, as to whether or not he adulterates his goods, or uses false weights, or otherwise cheats the public. He may fairly be said therefore to have a reputation for honesty or the reverse; and that reputation is some evidence of his real character. If a surgeon be tried for manslaughter through negligent and improper

treatment, the general opinion of his professional brethren, and of those among whom his practice lies, may be strong to show that he is a skilful, careful, and conscientious man. But these cases are exceptional, in respect both of the position of the accused and the nature of the quality to be inquired into; the position being one of publicity, the quality one upon which the public have an interest in forming a judgment. If either of these conditions be wanting, the case is very different, as a few examples will show. Suppose a servant girl to be accused of theft, and desirous of calling evidence of character; her master may have good reason for knowing her to be honest or dishonest, and so may her previous employers, but it is not likely that the question has ever occurred to anyone else. She cannot be said to have any reputation for honesty, unless reputation means the opinion of the two or three individuals competent to judge; and the rule which forbids those persons to state what they themselves think, and confines them to general reputation, seems to us virtually to exclude evidence of character altogether. The same may be said of cases in which the quality in question is one upon which the public do not commonly form any opinion, and the case actually before the judges was of the number. Whether any man is pure in mind and conduct, with a healthy abhorrence of indecency and unnatural vice, or has any depraved proneness to indecency, is a question which a few persons may be able to answer, but upon which, in ordinary cases, his neighbours have never thought of forming any opinion whatever. To ask, therefore, what his reputation for decency is, is only to ask whether he is notorious for indecency-a valueless question. In the cases just put, there cannot properly be said to be such a thing as reputation at all, but there are others in which reputation, however general, can have no weight on the question of guilty or not guilty. Some crimes, such as misappropriation of trust funds and frauds by confidential clerks, can only be committed by persons of good reputation, for no one else could be in a position to commit them. In such cases, to prove the prisoners' good reputation is to prove what the very accusation itself implies; yet evidence of character, in the other sense, might often justly have weight with the jury.

It would be easy to multiply examples on this subject, but space forbids, and those already adduced are sufficient to illustrate the view which we take of the rule established in *The Queen v. James Rowton*. That rule will probably not be rigidly acted upon; evidence of character may continue to be received with the same freedom as hitherto; at any rate, the natural unwillingness, both of judges and of prosecuting counsel, to hinder any honest defence is sure, in practice, greatly to mitigate the severity of the rule. But the rule, in its strictness, appears to us to exclude the best evidence of character in all cases, the only evidence in many, and the only valuable evidence in not a few.

REGISTRATION OF JOINT-STOCK COMPANIES.

Of all the limited liability companies announced during the year 1864, a very small proportion, if any, was brought before the public without the name of a firm of solicitors being attached to it, and this alone would form good ground for supposing that a legal adviser is believed to be necessary in the formation and carrying on of these undertakings. He must be a man of extensive experience who could, without the assistance of one specially educated in legal knowledge, launch and carry on. a limited joint-stock company. There is nothing new in the proposition here laid down, and indeed it is almost universally acknowledged to be necessary to the existence of a company to have a permanent adviser to whom all questions of law as well as of form may be referred.

The frequency of applications to the Metropolitan magistrates against companies which have not complied with the provisions of the Companies' Act 1862, leads us

to refer to the subject, and to call the attention of solicitors to the fact that most of the cases which have recently been reported in the daily press might have been prevented by a little care and attention on the part of the solicitors to the companies against whom applications have been made.

On a former occasion* we referred to the 44th section, when commenting on the alleged habitual evasion of its provisions by banking and insurance companies, and we have reason to believe that such companies are now as negligent, or as careful to evade their duty, in whichever manner their conduct may be described, as they were a year ago. The object of the provision made in the 44th section for the periodical publication of a statement of the debts and assets of the company will plainly appear by reference to the last three lines of that section, and it is a matter of surprise that no creditor has ever pressed for a share of the penalty for evasion to be awarded to himself under the 66th section.

In the early part of last month an application was made before the Lord Mayor against four of the directors of a joint stock company for "permitting a default to be made in complying with the provisions of the Companies' Act, 1862, with respect to forwarding the list of members of the company and the summary of particulars thereby required to the Registrar of Joint-Stock Companies." The charge was subsequently substantiated against the company, and the opening statement made by the solicitor for the applicants shows how necessary as a safeguard is the registration of the list of members. From the report of this statement the following appears to be the story of the formation of the company in question.

Towards the end of the year 1858 a company named the Maresfield Patent Gunpowder Company (Limited) was wound up in the Court of Bankruptcy, on the petition of Sharpe, one of the present defendants. Almost immediately afterwards, or in February, 1859, the Maresfield Gunpowder Company (Limited) was brought before the public with an alleged capital of £10,000, of which £5,000 was afterwards given to the defendant Sharpe for bringing it out. Shortly afterwards, Messrs. Clarke & Smith, a firm of great respectability, who had previously carried on a successful business at Coventry, but who had little experience of joint-stock companies, were invited to subscribe to the Maresfield Gunpowder Company by the defendants, who assured them that they had each of them put £1,000 into the concern, and they put into their hands a balance-sheet of its affairs, dated the 8th of February, 1860. This valuable document represented the capital to be £5,500; but, in fact, £5,000 of that amount consisted of free shares divided among the de fendants. On the other side of the account, the defendant Sharpe was put down as a debtor "on share account" in £500, so that, in point of fact, the capital of the company was nil. A sum of £1,840 was entered as a balance, which it was proposed to carry to a reserve account. In respect of "plant," &c., a sum of £5,200 was entered, but as there was no plant and no capital, these amounts represented what was purely imaginary. On the production of this balance-sheet, Messrs. Clarke & Smith were induced to invest £1,000 each. On the receipt of this money a prospectus was brought out, with a great flourish containing some statements, certainly not in accordance with these facts, but such as would induce investors to come forward. However, it was stated to the magistrates that not a shilling of money had been paid into the company by anyone except Clarke & Smith.

We are not told how these two gentlemen, although they both of them became directors of the company, and remained so for upwards of twelve months, were kept in ignorance of the fact that the $\pounds 2,000$ subscribed by themselves was the only real capital of the company; but when, after a time, a loss of $\pounds 8,000$ was shown, their suspicions were for the first time raised, and then, and then only, did they discover that the company was not registered.

All the defendants were shown to be men well acquainted with the business of joint-stock companies, whereas Clarke & Smith had never before had any

connection with one

Sympathy with men who, with their eyes open, allow themselves to be led into adopting what amounts to a fraud on the general public, would be thrown away; the fault or folly of Messrs, Clarke & Smith has met with its due punishment in the loss of their money; but with respect to the defendants, and having regard to their knowledge of the subject, any impartial person must conclude that the non-registration of the company puts their proceedings in a very questionable light.

It is not to be supposed for a moment that the defendants were ignorant of the provisions of the Act; that would be totally inconsistent with the fact that they were concerned in the getting up of companies. What motive then could there have been for non-compliance? The offence was not brought home to the defendants in their individual capacity, and therefore we have no right to impute fraud or wilful omission, but it is clear that any person asked to invest in the shares of an established company, and unable to find that it was registered, or to get at any list of its members, would suspect something wrong, and make inquiries. This course Messrs. Clarke & Smith, in their inexperience, did not adopt, and the result was, that their money was sunk in an abortive speculation.

From what has been said, the necessity that every section of the Act should be complied with is clearly apparent, and the more so as, in the event of such cases as we have mentioned becoming frequent, attempts will be made to fix the responsibility on individual members of the peccant company; no valid excuse for non-com-pliance can be made out, and therefore every case of

non-compliance raises a suspicion of wrong. Looking at the way in which some companies are got up, and the disposition, now so prevalent, to prop up any falling concern by making it into a limited company, by which means the proprietors get their capital restored to them out of the pockets of the shareholders, the occasional exposés which occur ought to serve as a caution, to

professional men in particular.

Towards the end of January the directors of the Littlehampton, Havre, and Honfleur Steamship Company (Limited) were summoned before the Lord Mayor on a charge of not forwarding a proper list of their members to the Registrar of Joint-Stock Companies. This was one of those affairs of large promise and small performance; the subscribed capital was £7,495, and out of that small amount no less than £7,000 had been absorbed in "preliminary expenses "-that is to say, chiefly in promotionmoney—leaving little more than £200 to trade with; and we cannot be surprised that the company is being wound up. The complaint in this case was dismissed, but a statement has been made embodying the facts, which, there is reason to believe, go to show this company to be a type of many others, in which the reckless management is of the same class as that exposed in the case of Bale v. Clela id *

The results of the speculative mania of 1864 will make themselves felt for many a long year, and very much will depend upon the carefulness of directors and managers, but more—very much more—will depend upon the legal advisers of limited companies, who are, perhaps, consulted only after difficulties arise, and whose first duty it is to see that all transactions are characterized by honourable dealing.

THE APPEAL OF DR. COLENSO .- On Thursday last the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council were resumed. Their Lordships, it is anticipated, will appoint an early day to give judgment in the appeal of Dr. Colenso, which appears in the list "Ex parte the Bishop of Natal for judgment." Up to yesterday no day had been named.

EQUITY.

ADMINISTRATION SUMMONS.

Piffard v. Vanreden, V. C. S., 13 W. R., 425.

Unless there be something in the circumstances of this case which is not disclosed in the report, it appears to us to be one of the most unmistakeable instances of "judicial legislation" which have come under our notice.

As reported, the facts are very simple. A Mrs. Piffard made her will, and appointed the plaintiff and defendant her executors. It does not appear that either of those gentlemen were interested in the property as residuary legatees, or next of kin, and there is strong ground for the presumption that whether the plaintiff was so or not, the defendant was merely executor and trustee, for one portion of the prayer of the bill is reported to have been for the removal of the defendant from his trusteeship.

In this state of things, a bill for administration, charg-ing wilful default, is filed by one executor against the other, and it is therein stated that all the debts and legacies have been paid. The defendant, after appearing to the bill, took out an administration summons, and a motion to discharge the order made upon such summons was re-

Now we do not feel the slightest doubt that if all the material facts are stated in the report, this order was made entirely without jurisdiction, and is in fact, notwithstanding his Honour's refusal to discharge it, a simple nullity. The only jurisdiction which the Court possesses to act by administration summons is derived from the 45th section of the Chancery Amendment Act (15 & 16 Vict. c. 86), which provides that "any person claiming to be a creditor, or a specific, pecuniary, or residuary legatee, or the next of kin, or some or one of the next of kin, of a deceased person," may "apply for, and obtain, as of course, without bill or claim filed, or any other preliminary proceedings; a summons . . . requiring the executor or administrator, as the case may be, of such deceased person" to show cause "why an order for the administration of the personal estate of the deceased should not be granted,' and, upon proof of the necessary facts, to make the order.

Where, in this section, is there to be found any provision authorising an executor to take out such a summons? Even supposing that an executor were himself one of the residuary legatees or next of kin, it is not easy to see how he could take out a summons calling on himself to show cause why he should not himself obtain an order, and there is no authority whatever in the section for reading the words "executor or administrator," as "executors or administrators, or any one or more of them." True the Act is later in date than the Parliamentary Language Act (13 & 14 Vict. c. 21), and, therefore, the words "executor or administrator," in the singular, will apply to the whole body of executors or administrators, however numerous: but this would not, we conceive, enable them to be disjoined, so as to permit one of them, even if otherwise filling one of the characters authorised, to take out such a summons. A multo fortiori, a mere executor who has no beneficial interest whatever, is not competent to obtain an order on such a summons. Accordingly, from the passing of the Act to the present day, there is not, we believe, a single case of a contested order baving been made on such a summons at the instance of an executor or administrator; if a few such orders have been made by consent, or without opposition, as is likely, they must be regarded merely as having passed per incuriam, and cannot be relied upon as precedents.

But even if that were not so, if the stream of precedent had been as clearly in favour of such a course as the absence of such precedent is against it, still, on the principles laid down by the Lord Chancellor, in his judgment in Foley v. Maillardet, 12 W. R. 355, 1De G. J. & S. 389; principles which, whether applicable to the case then before his Lordship or not, are, we humbly take leave to say, perfectly irrefragable; no amount of vicious practice on the part of the Court would have the effect of conferring a statutory jurisdiction which the statute did not give.

And the principal case itself furnishes a most conclusive vindication of the wisdom of the Legislature in withholding this power. If it were competent for any executor who pleased to take out a summons for the administration of the estate, and get the common order, he might, in almost every instance, use this order as a shield against an anticipated charge of wilful default; and though his Honour has in one instance held that the order affords no such protection (Re Brooker's Estate, 5 W. R. 382; 3 Sm. & G. 475), Vice-Chancellor Kindersley has, in Partington v. Reynolds, 6 W.R. 615, distinctly laid it down, and established by the clearest reasoning, that such a charge is inconsistent with the terms of the directed order, and beyond thepower of the Court, and in no reported instance has the doctrine of Vice-Chancellor Stuart in this respect received the countenance of any other judge.

But even if the jurisdiction to make such an order had existed, surely a more unfortunate instance of its exercise could scarcely have been seclected. An executor already charged with wilful default, having his conduct as executor and trustee already challenged in due form by bill, obtains an order which, if not merely nugatory, and a simple contrivance for making costs, must supersede the investigation desired by the bill. If the bill is suffered to proceed, the summons is of no earthly value, as every thing which could be done under it would follow as of course from a decree in the suit; and if the bill be stopped, the defendant will have been allowed to interfere to prevent that full investigation of his own conduct which the course of the Court prescribes for persons in his position.

In conclusion we can but repeat the words used in this Journal on a former occasion,* and with reference to a different case: - "We trust the case may be carried further, and if then affirmed, we must make up our minds to accept the doctrine as law, and do our best to guard against its consequences; meanwhile we shall continue to hope that it will not be affirmed." †

REVIEW.

An Essay upon Composition Deeds. By T. E. HOLLAND, M.A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, and of Lin-coln's-inn, Barrister-at-Law. London: Sweet. 1864.

Few who have been pratically engaged during the last three years in the profession of the law, and have endea-youred throughout that period to digest the ever-accumulating mass of cases relating to deeds of arrangement, will be inclined to dispute either the importance which Mr. T. E. Holland, in his preface, attaches to such deeds, or the existence of great practical difficulties in the interpretation of the Act, by which they are now regulated. And, however doubtful such persons may be, whether "the uncertainties which obscured the subject have, by the process of litigation, been to a certain extent, dispelled," they will scarcely deny the reasonableness of Mr. Holland's expectation that "a clear attack that he have have a dear detayer of what he have here deed these forms." clear statement of what has been done, deduced from a careful classification of the numerous decided cases, may be of some service." Whether, however, Mr. Holland's work fulfils the requirements of those who need information upon this subject may be open to doubt.

The arrangement clauses of the Bankruptey Act, 1861, demand a treatment somewhat different to that which the editor of an Act of Parliament is usually called upon to apply. They involve not only many points upon to apply. They involve not only many points of practice and difficulties requiring judicial interpretation, but, in a still more important degree, questions of what may be called judicial policy—questions, that is, in the decision of which the Courts have to act upon broad and equitable principles. The editor of such an Act has two opposite dangers to avoid-on the one hand, that of writing a speculative and unpractical essay; on the other hand, that of publishing a mere collection of marginal notes shaken into their places at

the foot of the sections to which they most immediately

Without going so far as to say that Mr. Holland has fallen altogether into the latter error, we cannot but think that he has approached it closely enough to detract considerably from the merit and value of his work. The cases decided upon sections 192—200, of the Act of 1861, up to August, 1864, have been industriously collected and arranged in an roots, have been industriously concered and arranged in a order, not perhaps the most logical, but sufficiently convenient for purposes of reference. The "annotations upon the sections," and the chapters upon "ccessio bonorum" and the necessity of providing in the deed for all creditors equally, will probably be useful to those who wish to obtain a refer to the latest authorities upon any of the matters which are there discussed. Much unnecessary matter has, how-ever, been inserted in several of the chapters, and if Mr. Holland should be encouraged to print a second edition, we should recommend him to compress the contents of the chapters which treat of sections of the Bankruptcy Act other than those immediately relating to deeds of arrangement, and of the general orders, into ten or a dozen pages. In the short chapter on pleas and deeds, references in a note to Clapham v. Atkinson, Dewhirst v. Jones, and Strick v. De Mattos might well be substituted.

Again, some of the cases cited will hardly support the propositions to which they are appended. In re Uastleton, for example (p. 37), scarcely decided that "the majority nust be of joint, as well as separate, creditors." So, also, at page 120, an extract from the judgment of the Lord Chancellor in Ex parte Spyer is set forth in such manner as to give the unwary reader the impression that that very learned and eminent lawyer had deliberately stultified himself, and created a new kind of implied cessio bonorum in every trust deed clearly registered under section 192. A careful perusal of Wishart v. Fowler, and a glance at the Lord Chancellor's decision in Re Skinner (16 Nor. 1864), will show that Mr. Holland is mistaken in citing the former case as deciding that "the time for registration may be extended even after the expiration of the twenty-eight days for the purposes of section 192, as well as of section 194.

We repeat that those who wish to refer to the latest cases upon the composition clauses of the Bankruptey Act, 1861, will find them in Mr. Holland's work; and we believe that by the amendment of certain errors (caused evidently by a too hasty study of the authorities), and the substitution in several places of a more philosophical arrangement for that at present adopted, the work might be made both useful and

COURTS.

COURT OF CHANCERY. (Before Sir W. P. WOOD.)

Mar. 1 .- Peacock v. Peacock .- An Attorney's will .- This was an administration suit, in which a question of some legal importance was submitted for the decision of his Honour.

The testator, an attorney, carrying on business at South-sea, near Portsmouth, did, in the will now in question, be-queath the legacies hereafter mentioned, without naming any fund from which they were to come. Then came the following residuary devise:—"And I give and bequeath all the rest and residue and remainder of my personal estate, money, debts, and securities, and all and every my messuages, lands, tenements, hereditaments, and real estate whatsoever, to my executors, share and share alike." The personal property of the testator was insufficient for the payment of debts, and the question now arose whether legacies, one of £50 to a stranger, and one of £500 to an executrix, were or were not charged upon the real estate of the testator.

Mr. Rolt, Q.C., Mr. Cotterel, Mr. Casson, Mr. Decimus Sturges, Mr. Mackeson, and Mr. Augustine Langdon were engaged in the case.

The VICE-CHANCELLOR, who had reserved his judgment, said that although there was no authority for holding legacies to be a charge upon real estate, except (first) where there was an express direction to an executor to pay a legacy followed by a gift to him of the real estate, and (secondly) where there was a gift of the "residue" of real estate, and although the present case satisfied neither of these conditions he then the think the left of these conditions. ditions, he thought that, looking to the intention, as far as

^{* 7} Sol. Jour. 64: † The case of which these words were originally written (*Lech-mere v. Brotheridge*), was not appealed, but the doctrine contended against in this Journal has since been overruled.

it could be gathered from the words of the will, it was manifest that the testator intended the lady in question to have her £500 in addition to her one-fifth share of the have her though it added to the state of his property into one common mass, which was not to be divided until that legacy had been paid. This legacy must, therefore, be considered as charged on the real estate. As to the legacy of £50, there might have been some difficulty about it if it had stood alone, but he had no doubt, that according to the true construction of the will, it also was a charge upon the real estate.

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY.

(Before Mr. Commissioner Holroyd.)

Feb. 24.—In re Daniel Thomas Woodhams.—A meeting for examination and discharge was held under the bankruptcy of Mr. D. T. Woodhams, attorney and solicitor, of 11, Frederick-place, Camberwell New-road, and of Kenning-The unsecured debts are returned at £1,076; with secured ditto, £45; and creditors to be paid in full, £7; against property given up to assignees, £10; and property in the hands of creditors, £25. The bankruptcy was mainly attributable to insufficiency of income.

No opposition was offered, but an adjournment pro forma became necessary, in consequence of the accounts having

been filed one day too late.

SHERIFF'S COURT.

(Before Mr. Commissioner KERR.)

Feb. 25.—The Metropolitan Coal Consumers' Company (Limited) v. Edwards.—This was an action brought by the company against an alleged shareholder for calls.

The defendant, it was contended, had applied for shares, and those shares were duly allotted to him, his name being entered on the register in conformity with the statute. This, it was contended, made him a shareholder by virtue of section 11 of the Companies' Act, 1862.

His HONOUR was of opinion that before defendant could be made a shareholder he must have given a written accept-

ance for the shares.

The Secretary read a clause as to the names of share-holders being entered in the register, and that would be

His Honour was quite sure that there was a special clause as to the acceptance of shares being in writing. Now, where was that writing?

The Secretary produced the proposal of the defendant, in which were the words-"I agree to accept such shares.

His HONOUR.-How could that be an acceptance, when he had not received the shares. Acceptance means clearly after the shares are allotted to the shareholders, and then to be in writing. I must find a verdict for the defendant, with

LIVERPOOL COUNTY COURT.

Feb. 24.—St. Patrick's Burial Society.—It is ordered that the affairs of this society be conducted by the registrar of the court. That gentleman is to have the custody of the money and documents, and to meet the current expenses until the case is finally settled.

GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.

CONVEYANCING.

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTION SUBMITTED BY "A SOLICI-TOR," IN JOURNAL FOR 18th of FEBRUARY, 1865.

Sir,—In reply to a solicitor's query in your paper of 18th inst., I may refer to Mr. F. V. Hawkins' very useful treatise "On the Construction of Wills" (price 10s. 6d.); at p. 190 the author say, "A devise to A. and his issue, or to A. for life, and after his decease to his issue, vests in A. an estate tail: Roddy v. Fitzgerald, 6 Ho. of Lds. Cas. 823." Again, at p. 197, it is stated that "A gift of real estate to A. and his issue, of course confers an estate tail." I think that the addition of the works "for ever" in the green with that the addition of the words "for ever" in the case put are either surplusage, or merely emphasize the entail, and have not the effect of altering the meaning from being words of limitation into words of purchase. The issue, or offspring, of each of the specific legatees, A. and B., appear to me to have been particularly in the testator's mind. With respect

to the effect of B. and her issue having to pay legacies, Crozier v. Crozier, 3 D. & War. 373; Goodtitle v. Meddern, 4 East, 496; Vick v. Sneter, 3 Ell. & Bl. 219; Denn v. Stater, 5 T. R. 335; Doe v. Ovens, 1 B. & Ad. 318; and other cases quoted in Mr. Tudor's work on Real Property and Conveyancing, may be referred to; but they do not appear to enlarge or curtail the ordinary meaning of the ordinary word "issue," or the effect of the gifts.

M. F. Feb. 22.

A. took an estate tail, and, assuming that she did not bar the entail, upon her death, the executory devise in favour of B took effect; and B is now tenant in tail. Lord Thurlow remarked, in *Hockley* v. *Mawbey*, 1 Ves. Jun. 159, that a devise to A and his issue was "the aptest way of describing

an estate tail.'

an estate tail." The word "issue" has proved a mine of wealth to the legal profession, but the questions raised upon it have turned mainly, upon the effect of words added to it. With respect to the simple devise to B and her issue in this case, the decisions leave no room to doubt as to its conferring an estate tail on B. The word has been fenced with so considerably, and has caused such endless hair-splitting, that it is difficult to single out for reference any one particular leading case. I would refer to Wild's case, 6 Rep. 16; Shelly's case, 1 Rep. 94.

In the leading case of demise, Dodson v. Grew, two of the judges gave their opinion that the word was a word of limitation, and not a word of purchase. P. D.

Feb. 23.

[We give this answer as received; but our correspondent does not seem to have considered the effect of the charge and payment of legacies. The question is, does this enlarge B.'s estate into a fee-simple?— ED. S. J.]

LEASE FOR THREE YEARS.

Sir,—In December last, by agreement in writing (not under seal) A agreed to let unto B a dwelling house, &c., for three years, from the 13th of May, 1865. Is this a lease for more than three years from the making thereof?—that is, would the words "from the making thereof" in the Statute of Frauds be held to refer to the date of the agreement in question, or to the time from whence the term is to commence? But, perhaps, the document would be considered merely an agreement to lease, and so fall within the 4th section of the statute referred to and not within the 1st. Opinions are solicited.

Feb. 23.

Feb. 23.

[There can be no doubt that the agreement is void by the united operation of the Statute of Frauds and the Act of 8 & 9 Vict., but we cannot at this moment lay our hand on a decided case. - ED. S. J.)

PRACTICE TEXT-BOOKS.

Sir,-What recent works on common law practice, and chancery practice, with supplements containing the rules and orders of the courts, would you or your readers recom-mend to a practitioner requiring a good work on both these

I have seen advertised somewhere Moore's "Instructions for Preparing Abstracts of Title," and Braithwaite's "Oaths in Chancery." Are the works useful ones?

A COUNTRY PRACTITIONER.

APPOINTMENTS.

The Right Hon. WILLIAM NATHANIEL MASSEY to be an Ordinary Member for the Council of the Governor-General of India.

S. H. C. Maddock, of 3, Spring-gardens, Westminster, gent., to be a commissioner for administering oaths in common law, in all courts, and for taking acknowledgments of married women.

JAMES GIBSON, Esq., Chairman of Quarter Sessions for the Queen's County, to be chairman for the County Donegal, vice Robert Andrews, Esq., Q.C., deceased.

CHARLES KELLY, Esq., Q.C., of the Connaught Circuit, to be chairman of the Queen's County, vice James Gibson, Esq., promoted.

JAMES POWELL, of Pocklington, in the East Riding of Yorkshire, gent., to be a commissioner to administer oaths in chancery.

PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATION.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Friday, Feb. 24.

COURTS OF JUSTICE CONCENTRATION (SITE) BILL.

On the motion of Mr. COWPER, the select committee on this bill was constituted of Mr. Cowper, Mr. Selwyn, Mr. Crawford, and Mr. Murray, with three members to be named by the committee of selection.

Monday, Feb. 27. INNS OF COURT.

Sir G. Bower moved for leave to bring in a bill to enable the benchers of the Inns of Court to appoint judicial committees in certain cases, and to give the necessary powers to such committees. The hon. baronet stated that the measure was similar to that of last year, except in two particulars. He proposed two alterations, which he had reason to believe would obtain for the bill a more favourable reception than it obtained last year.

Leave was given, and the bill read a first time.

Pending Measures of Legislation.

ATTORNEYS AND SOLICITORS.

A bill intituled an Act to amend the Law relating to Attorneys and Solicitors, presented to the House of Lords by the Lord Chancellor.

Be it enacted, &c.

1. A contract between an attorney or solicitor and his client respecting his remuneration for any professional services, either past or future, whether the contract be for payment of a gross sum or for payment of any sum or sums to be ascertained according to any principle, rate, or mode differing from the rules which would otherwise regulate the amount of such remuneration, and whether the remunera-tion contracted for be greater or less than that to which such attorney or solicitor would otherwise be entitled, shall be valid; provided that the validity, construction, and effect of such contract may be determined in any proceeding by motion, petition, or rule in the matter of the attorney or solicitor without suit.

2. The officer to whom it shall be referred to tax a bill of fees, charges, and disbursements of any attorney or solicitor which has been delivered, sent to, or left with the client in manner required by the Act of the 6 & 7 Vict. c. 73, shall have the like power to award interest thereon from the time when demand of payment shall have been made in writing, so as such demand shall give notice to the debtor that interest will be claimed from the date of such demand until the term of payment, as by the 23rd section of 3 & 4 Will. 4, are given to juries with respect to the debts or sums

there mentioned.

3. An attorney or solicitor being trustee or executor shall be entitled, either alone or jointly with his partner or partners (if any), to the payment of professional fees and charges for professional business done by him or his firm in connexion with the duties or powers of the trusteeship or execu-

4. An attorney or solicitor may take security from his client for his future fees, charges, and disbursements.
5. Construction of "attorney," "solicitor," and "client."

IRELAND.

COURT OF EXCHEQUER.

(Before the Lord Chief Baron and a Special Jury.) PRIVILEGE-OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS-EVIDENCE-PUBLIC POLICY-PRISONS' ACT.

M'Elveney v. Corry Connellan.—This was an action for libel, and damages were laid at £600. The plaintiff had been a hatchman and doorkeeper in the City Marshalsea, and the defendant is one of the Inspectors-General of Prisons. The alleged libels were said to have been contained in a report made to the Lord Lieutenant by the defendant, after holding an investigation. They were in the following words:

—"I find that M Elveney has been guilty of aiding, assisting, and assenting in a fraudulent transaction and corrupt begging with Dillon by consenting to subscribe part of rupt bargain with Dillon, by consenting to subscribe part of the hush-money to prevent and keep back the witnesses." Also—"If those hatchmen (naming the plaintiff and others)

are not removed, it will be impossible to maintain the discipline of the prison." The plaintiff complained that in cipline of the prison." The plaintiff complained that in consequence of these representations, which he charged as false and malicious, he was dismissed from his situation. The defendant pleaded—first, a denial of the publication, and Mr. Butt, Q.C., Mr. Ball, Q.C., and Mr. Phillips, appeared for the plaintiff.

Mr. Serjeant Armstrong, Mr. Whiteside, Q.C., and Mr.

Waters, for the defendant.

The Attorney-General attended on behalf of the Lord

Lieutenant, to watch the proceedings.

Mr. Ball, Q.C., having stated the plaintiff's case.

Mr. Joseph Harmer, Registrar in the Chief Secretary's office, was sworn—The document now produced is signed by Sir Thomas Larcom (Under-Secretary).

Have you any documents here ?- I have no documents. Mr. Phillips claimed his right to read the letter of Sir Thomas Larcom, to show that the witness was directed to produce the documents.

Mr. Serjeant Armstrong objected.
The Lord Chief Baron held that the document was not evidence in the case.

Mr. Ball said that the witness was directed to attend with The Lord Chief Baron.—If the head of the department

says it would be injurious to the public service to produce it in evidence

Attorney-General.—As representing the department, my lord, I state that it is his opinion that it would be injurious to the public service to produce it.

Mr. Ball submitted that the privilege did not exist in this ase. The report was made under the provisions of the Prisons Act, the 60th section of which provided that if any Inspector-General of Prisons should knowingly state anything false in his reports he should henceforth be incapable to hold office, and should forfeit same. By this provision the Legislature evidently intended that the report should be

open for public investigation.

The Lord Chief Baron.—I will take it that the Attorney-General appears and says that the report in question has been placed in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant, who is ready to attend himself with the document, and state that it would be, in his opinion, prejudicial to the public service to produce it, and therefore objects to do so.

Mr. Ball then argued that Sir Thomas Larcom's letter re-

moved the plea of privilege.

The Lord Chief Baron held, on this point, that the Lord Lieutenant withdrew the permission of Sir Thos. Larcom to produce the document.

Mr. Butt contended that if the Lord Chief Baron refused to direct the production of the report, it would be reducing Ireland to the condition of Venice, where the Council of Ten Ireland to the condition of venice, where the Council of Ten put up the Lion's Mouth for every informer to drop his slanderous accusations into. If the report could be produced in favour of Mr. Connellan, it could equally be produced against him; and, therefore, it was idle to talk about its production being detrimental to the public service.

The Lord Chief Baron said in his opinion the production of the document could not be enforced against the principle upon which the decisions in these cases cited were made. He could not see how this case could possibly be distinguished from *Hume v. Bentinck*, 2 B. & B. 130; (Taylor on Evid. s. 866,) that the minutes of the evidence and the report of a tribunal which did not exist under the common law or any statute, and was merely a tribu-nal appointed for the purpose of aiding the Com-mander-in-Chief in the discharge of his duties, should not be disclosed. It was held that where the Government inquired into the conduct of their own officers and a report was made, it was against the public policy to allow such disclosures to be made. Even under the 60th section the production of the document could not be enforced. The effect of the 60th section was that the Lord Lieutenant, or those acting for him, or the Crown, should investigate the matter and dismiss the officer. His lordship held that this was a confidential communication made in obedience to an Act of Parliament, and, therefore, should not be disclosed.

It was then contended by the plaintiff's counsel that the defendant, by not denying in his plea that he had written the report, must be taken as admitting that fact; and to prove the publication, which was denied, they called Mr. John Lentaigne, one of the inspectors of prisons. Mr.

Lentaigne stated that he had frequently conversed with his colleague (Mr. Connellan) in reference to the action which had been brought against him by the plaintiff, and that Mr. Connellan said the action could not be maintained, because it was absurd to charge him with malice, inasmuch as everything he had done in the matter had been approved of and advised by Mr. Lentaigne. Mr. Connellan also said that the summons and plaint did not set forth correctly the words of his report to the Lord Lieutenant.

The Chief Baron held that this was not sufficient evidence of publication, and another witness was produced, who swore that, on one occasion, Mr. Connellan told him that certain hatchmen had been dismissed for allowing drink to be brought into the prison, and for subscribing hush-money to prevent witnesses being brought forward against them. Mr. Butt argued that sufficient evidence of publication

had been given to sustain the action.

His Lordship held that there was not sufficient evidence of publication, and accordingly the plaintiff submitted to a nonsuit on that point.

PROBATE DUTY.

The following judgment has been given in a case in which a proceeding was taken to compel an executor to pay duty upon certain property which had been the subject of a settlement under which it passed, and which the executor had, therefore, omitted from the inventory on which duty was assessed. The facts appear sufficiently in the judgment.

The Commissioners of Inland Revenue v. Hyland. -The Lord Chief Baron, in delivering the judgment of the Court, said the information which had originally been given by the executor to the Probate Court, was given with a view to the payment of the duty. The document so lodged in the Probate Court was transmitted to the legacy-office, and in that document the executor stated why it was the stock-in-trade did not form part of the assets-namely, because by a deed to the members of the family named in the memorandum.

That was giving a clear and distinct intimation to the legacy department that that property was the subject of gift. When they found this proved by a document coming out of the de-partment itself, he thought it would be mere trifling to let the case stand for any affidavit, which could not displace the cardinal fact, that what was admittedly the only matter of controversy, was shown to the commissioners in 1859. The commissioners asked for such information as would enable them to assess duty. The commissioners wanted to charge duty upon the property included in the deed; but it was not suggested that the deed could be impeached. All the requisite information had been given. The Court had nothing to do unless they called upon the executor to admit what it would be insane of him to admit, and what the Court had no jurisdicsane of him to admit,—and what the Court han he jurisuc-tion to force him to admit—that the property comprised in the deed was assets. The present application seemed to have been made either in forgetfulness of what passed in 1859, or from inattention. It might have been that the officers had been changed, and that the present staff knew nothing of what had passed.

Mr. Macdonogh, Q.C., said he was instructed to state that it arose from the death of the gentleman who was the officer in 1859. It was not known that he had seen the deed.

The Lord Chief Baron said it was strange nobody in the office knew anything of it. It would have been well if the officer had looked at the documents in the Probate Court, and seen that the account then rendered was in exact conformity with the account now rendered, and then, as a test, the deed might have been called for. The Court must decide there was no foundation whatever for the motion, and must refuse it with

ROLLS COURT.

TRADE MARKS-COUNTERFEIT TITLES.

Cassell v. Boyd .- This case came before the Master of the Rolls on a petition praying for an injunction to restrain Mr. Samuel Boyd, druggist, of Mary-street, Dublin, from selling under the name of "Cazeline" or any other title resembling it, any oil not the manufacture of the petitioners, Messrs. Cassell, Smith, and Company, of 80, Fenchurch-street, London. The case of the petitioners was, that having com-menced in August, 1862, the sale of a lamp-oil manufactured by them from American curd petroleum, by a process invented by a French chemist, that article obtained a very considerable sale in Ireland; and that, finding the sale fall off latterly, they instituted inquiries, the result of which

was that they found the respondent was selling another article under the name "Cazeline." The "C" of this word was, however, by a stroke of a pen made "G," so that the word affected to appear "Gazeline." Proceedings were then instituted. The case of the respondent was, that he had in instituted. The case of the respondent was, that he mad in 1862, commenced the importation of petroleum oil, to which he gave the name of "Gazoline," suggested by the name of a French article of commerce, known as "Gazogene;" and that the labels having been printed "Cazeline" was the printer's error, and not intentional on his (respondent's)

His Honour said it was most discreditable to traders to attempt counterfeiting the trade marks of others, and so long as he occupied a seat on the Bench he would reprobate such practices. The coincidence of the names in this case such practices. The coincidence of the names in this case was strange, if accidental, and should further proceedings become necessary, he would order an examination viva voce of the printer. He would make an order restraining the respondent from selling any oil as "Cazeline" which was not purchased from the petitioners; the costs to be costs in

The Solicitor-General, with Mr. MacKenna, appeared for the petitioners; the Right Hon. A. Brewster, Q.C., with Mr. Boyd, for the respondent.

Mr. Boyd, for the respondent.

Since the petition was heard, the respondent has published a letter stating that "no injunction was granted against him; and that the court made no order on the petitioner's application adopting the undertaking given before the filing of the petition. He admits the sale by assistants of "a small quantity of the best refined petroleum as "Cazeline" small quantity of the best refined petroleum as "Cazeline" oil, and regrets the name ever was used contrary to his instructions and without his knowledge." He also states that the plaintiff has lost any right in the word "Cazeline," by having represented his oil as "patent" when it is not so. If this statement be correct the plaintiff is out of court on the principle laid down by Lord Westbury in the case of the Leather-Cloth Companies.*

FOREIGN TRIBUNALS & JURISPRUDENCE.

CHURCH REFORM.

The following is a summary of the resolutions adopted by the committee of the Italian Parliament relative to religious corporations :

1. The civil administration of the Catholic worship is to be confided to the diocesan and parochial institutes in the interest of Catholic inhabitants. These institutes are to be be confided to the diocesan and parconial institutes in the interest of Catholic inhabitants. These institutes are to be named by the Catholic diocesan and parochial electors, in conformity with a special law. 2. All monastic property is to be sold in the course of ten years, in lots, large and small. and the price to be paid in fifteen annual instalments. price of this property is to be invested in the public funds, for the benefit of the religious institutes. 3. The religious orders are all to be suppressed, with the exceptions indicated by the law. 4. Of the surplus income from the money invested, one-third is to go to the public worship fund, and two-thirds to the provinces and communes where the estates were situated, to be employed for public instruction and the relief of the poor. 3. There is to be a bishop or archbishop for each administrative province.

FRANCE. LAW OF WILLS.

At Rheims a will has been set aside for "ingratitude"— a cause known to the Code Napoleon. In the present in-stance the ingratitude was of a very decided character, for it scance are ingratuture was or a very declared character, for it consisted in murdering the testator. The murderer afterwards committed suicide, and then his wife, who was joint-lugatee with him, claimed the property. The suit was instituted against her by the heirs-at-law, and the decree is in their favour.

AMERICA.

The report of the following important case is taken from the Legal Intelligencer:—

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, PHILADELPHIA.-KINIKE v. MATTHEWS.

This was a claim upon two ground-rent deeds, dated October 12, 1773, in each of which there was a reservation

* 8 Sol. Jour. 571.

of a ground rent of twenty-one pure silver coined Spanish pieces of eight, and one-third of such pieces of eight, each piece of eight weighing seventeen penny-weights and six grains, or so much of the lawful money of the province of Pennsylvania as shall be sufficient from time to time to "purchase or procure" the same, with a covenant for the payment of such rent by the grantee, his heirs and assigns, in the same words as the reservation.

At the time the annual rents fell due, October 12, 1863, the defendants, who were then owners of the lots out of which the ground rents were reserved, tendered twenty-one dollars and one-third in legal tender notes of the United States, as satisfaction of each of said annual rents. Plaintiff refused to accept the tender, and claimed that he was entitled to a judgment for the highest value of the pieces of eight between the time when the rents fell due and the time of triel

Thompson J., observing that the case did not call for any examination or decision upon the constitutionalty of the legal tender acts of Congress, held—

1. That the covenant was not satisfied by the tender of the notes; that the reservation was of a particular kind of coin, with the alternative of its value in lawful money; and that the ground landlord was entitled either to the particular kind of coin, or its real value in lawful money.

lar kind of coin, or its real value in lawful money.

2. That the measure of damages was the value of the coin at the time the rent fell due, and that the plaintiff could not recover more on the ground that that description of coin has since been worth more.

Ludlow, J., concurred.

Judgment for the value of the particular coin on October 12, 1863, with interest.

SOCIETIES AND INSTITUTIONS.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE PROMOTION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE.

Mr. Chadwick's Paper on the Conveyance of Passengers and Goods on Railways.

(Continued from page 335.)

The next point to consider is the question of security.

The Board of Trade, impelled by the public feeling on the frequency of dreadful railway accidents, has addressed remonstrant circulars to the railway directors, but that department having little or no real power, no attention appears to have been paid to its admonitions. At length Her Majesty herself has written to them, reminding them of the heavy responsibility they have assumed since they have succeeded in securing the monopoly of the means of travelling of almost the entire population of the country, and appealing to them as it were to independent potentates, she expresses the hope that the same security may be insured for all her people as is so carefully provided for herself. This benign appeal is coldly received, if we may judge from the speech of one railway chairman, who meets it by what I must say is an abuse of statistics, and a reference to the small number killed in proportion to the great number of persons carried, as if one preventable death, or painful mutilation, were justifiable by reference to the largest general average of those unhurt; as if one shocking outrage, or one dreadful murder, and all the painful sense of insecurity created by it amongst millions was to be passed over as a mere insignificant unit, and a was to be passed over as a mere magnificant unit, and a matter of no account, by comparison with the vast amount of units to be dealt with! The pernicious principle of exactions on necessities is extended to the most petry details; thus, everybody complains of the bad lights commonly given in the third-class carriages. The extra fare paid by third-class passengers in a long journey, would be 10s. each traveller, or £3 for the six passengers. A few pence extra would supply a light by which the passengers might read pleasantly; but the answer is that it cannot be afforded, and that supply a light by which the passengers might read pleasantly;
—but the answer is that it cannot be afforded, and that
what they have will do; those who really want to read may
provide lights for themselves, the company is not obliged
to spend money for them! The justification of high fares
for the first-class passengers, for long journeys, is that no
one travels long journeys unless he is obliged, and that
therefore he may be subjected to a higher charge on his
necessities than would be justified by a consideration of the necessities than would be justified by a consideration of the service. On this maleficent principle of exactions on necessities, until Parliament interfered, third-class passengers— the old, little children, the feeble, and females as well as

males—were huddled together in pens, and hurled through the air in uncovered carriages, in the worst weather. The poor were to be made miscrable to deter second or first-class passengers from going amongst them to escape from the exactions on the presumed necessities of their social position. The plea for such inferior conveyance was, that at 1d. a mile better carriages could not be afforded; the fact being that the prime cost of conveyance is, even for the first-class, a penny for about fifteen miles, while for the third-class, it is a penny for some forty miles.

Instances have occurred of reductions of fares under competition to one-fourth and one-fifth the previous average of common rates, that nevertheless have been productive of increased net returns. Such rates as a penny fare for ten miles, or twopence going and returning have, I am informed, proved the most remunerative of any, and tended to establish a most important precedent for the daily transit of working men to healthy suburban residences, at a cost perhaps not greater than that of the difference of weekly rent. One of the most important examples, as it appears to me, of the effect of reduced charges, was in a competition between the London and North Western Railway, in the London, Birm-ingham, Wolverhampton, and Stour Valley district, which includes the lines between Dudley and Birmingham, Wolverhampton and Birmingham, Shrewsbury and Wellington. The London and North Western Railway Company were induced, much at the instance of Mr. W. Richardson Roebuck (who was then the manager of the Stour Valley Railway, but who is now at the head of an eminent trading firm in Manchester), to reduce their fares in varying rates of a fourth or fifth of the previous proportions in the district. The development of traffic was such as to astonish himself and the other local railway agents and managers, particularly the unwonted development from sparsely populated lines, and these lower fares were, in their opinion, highly remunerative, and they would have been more so if the fares had been maintained. Yet on the cessation of the competition, the company returned to the previous high rates, for which no other reason was assigned than that if the low fares were continued, the public travelling on the rest of the company's lines would be struck with the contrast, and would be dissatisfied with the high fares. And it is a matter of inquiry, on behalf of the shareholders as well as of the population, why the example should not have been extended throughout the whole of the company's lines! The receipts per train, at a penny fare from Shrewsbury to Upton Magna were in December, 1858, £11 15s. 8d., but on the return to 34d. in November, 1859, the receipts per train fell to Walcot, were at a penny £14 17s. 7d., and at 6d. they fell, in October, 1859, to £4 5s. 5d. The results of the Upton Magna case were borne out, even to a greater extent, at each station between Shrewsbury and Wellington. It is further to be noted from such instances how many more are hindered from travelling by high fares than would be anticipated, à priori. Mr. Richardson Roebuck says on this

"My experience convinces me that railway traffic is one of the most sympathetic things you can touch. It appreciates instantly and to the utmost, every little advantage you concede, and every trifling encouragement you give it; and conversely, it collapses, dwindles, and withers, under the slighest illiberality of management or immoderate rates. When a railway traverses a very populous district, I hold that its management is seriously at fault the moment a poor man stands and hesitates whether he shall ride or walk. The fares ought to be so low that to walk, as a matter of economy, would become an absurdity; and until such policy pervades the administration of railway affairs, we shall never hear of anything but low dividends."

Mr. William Galt cites other instances confirmatory of those to which I have referred, of the development of traffic by reduced fares, e. g., such as that of the contest between the South Eastern and the Great Western for the Reading traffic, where the former reduced the fares to the rate of 2s. 3d. for the first-class, 1s. 6d. for the second-class, per hundred miles, and where the chairman stated that the company lost nothing by the low fares, and that they were very well satisfied to go on; and such again as the contest between the Glasgow and Edinburgh and the Caledonian lines, where the first-class fares were reduced from 8s. to 1s., the second-class from 6s. to 9d., the third-class from 4s. to 6d., or to a rate per hundred miles, for the first-class 2s. 3d., for the second-class 1s. 9d., and for the third-class 1s. 2d.,

and where the reduction of the company's dividend was only

1 per cent. per annum.

M. Dupuit, engineer of the ponts et chaussees, and a writer on political economy, has written on tolls and on prices, applicable to the administration of railways. Starting from the point where a road is free from toll, he shows that as the toll is increased from a certain point, the net receipts from it increase, after which they diminish and are extinfrom it increase, after which they diminish and are extinguished, whilst the uses of the road to the public are from the first obstructed and diminished in another and larger ratio than the receipts. This is displayed in the following table; supposing the tariff of a railway (or it may be of a canal, or a bridge, or a tax, or a price) allows a given amount of traffic which is accompanied by a corresponding ratio of receipts :-

•••••		•••••	Ò
•••••	80		
			80
**********	63	***************************************	126
	. 50		150
	41		164
•••••	33		165
	. 26		156
	20		140
	. 14		112
	9		81
	. 6		60
	. 3		33
	. 0	***************************************	0
		50 41 42 26 20 14 9 66 30 0	50

In many points of view, the divergence of the ratios of receipts and of traffic have been much greater, but this table will serve to illustrate the fallacy of the common assertion of the identity of the interests of the private speculators with those of the public in traffic charges. The divergence of those interests is displayed by the comparison of the column of traffic with that of the column of receipts. If the railway is in the hands of a trading company it is evidently not their interest to augment the tolls beyond a given amount. But they have no such interest as the public have

to lower them beyond that amount.

The Government may be content with 5 per cent., whilst the trading company may require 10. To get the maximum of receipts the company may put their traffic at 5, in which case use of the road will be confined to 33, whilst the Government may be content to put the toll at 2 on the scale, in which case the traffic on the use of the road will be ex-tended or maintained at 63. The Government, M. Dupuit observes, would thus render the road useful to twice the number of persons; but under the rule in the interest of the company, it would be as if the bridge, or canal, or railway, did not exist, so far as concerns those thirty passengers, travellers, or tons of goods. The proofs are numerous that in general the trading companies which have possession of public lines of communication, are not to be moved by a small benefit to themselves to do a large one to the public. Such examples as those I have cited, of three and four-fold uses of what should be public ways ruthlessly sacrificed, where the trouble to them is small if the gain to themselves be not great-or the instance cited of the ruthless exclusion of thousands from social intercourse, as well as from commerce, is by no means complimentary to the state of public information and spirit, where it is permitted to be done without question or remonstrance.

In respect to the productive rates of fares, which I must assume to be rates for undivided traffic, Mr. Galt refers to the fact of the actual cost of conveyance by excursion trains, or by any trains where there is a full load, being 6d. for the first-class, 4d. for the second-class, and 21d. for the thirdclass, per 100 miles of conveyance; and he states it as a notorious fact that the excursion trains, at one-third the usual rates of fares, are the most profitable in their traffic; the excursion fares on the London and Brighton being, to and from Portsmouth, at the rate of 4s. for the first class, and 2s. for enclosed carriages; of the London and North Western, 5s. for the first-class, and 3s. for the enclosed carriages; of the Great Western, to and from Plymouth, 6s. 3d. for the first-class, and for covered carriages, 4s. 2d. per 100 miles. This last, for the first-class, is nearly the Belgian rate of charge. The proposition for railway reform which he sustains, may be stated to be this-that by public intervention for unity of management, every day in the year shall, for railway travel, be an excursion day for all classes of persons in the United Kingdom. But would the trains fill sufficiently every day? The answer is the experience of various competitions, maintained for periods of a year or more, showing that even in sparsely populated districts, trains do go very full, even when the traffic is wastefully divided between two, that might be concentrated on one. As to the question of the insufficiency of the existing traffic accommodation, we should not deceive ourselves by regarding only short lines of densely populated districts. The fact is, that according to the official returns, the average number of passengers conveyed by each train in the kingdom is only seventy-one, inclusive of all the excursionists, and is only seventy-one, inclusive of all the calculations of the season ticket holders, who may increase the average to seventy-four; but Mr. Galt points out that if the excursionists be excluded, the average number of passengers on ordinary trains cannot exceed fifty; that is to say, one-twentieth part of a fair maximum load of one engine on a railway with ordinary gradients;—so that, as he puts it, on the great average of railway conveyances, they may each be compared, as a paying concern, to an old four-horse stage coach rarely carrying more than one passenger on an average each journey. I have myself been assured by railway spoken, that they would have no difficulty in carrying regularly a three or four-fold traffic, with little additional expense. I have been assured by a nignry connector Man-that 10s. fares would pay better than 30s. fares to Man-chester, especially if there were trains exclusively for passengers, which would make the journey, as they might, in three hours, so as to enable a commercial man from London three hours, so as to enable a commercial man from Loranza to go by an early train, see his goods and make his purchases for himself, and return home in the evening of the same day. Mr. Galt considers that, as in the analogous case of the penny post, there might be for a time some loss by the adoption of the plan of a general low rate of railway fares, as there was on the adoption of the plan of the uniform penny postage, and he proposes that the public shall take the risk of the probable deficit, probably of £2,000,000 or £3,000,000 for a year or two, for the sake of the enormous national advantage of low and uniform fares, until by the development of traffic by them a return of surplus income is obtained. It is generally thought by impartial persons who have considered the facts and reasonings set forth in his work, that the proposal is one which of itself deserves serious examination.

In respect to the important question of the determination of remunerative charges, traders, men of business, who have been successful in small concerns, are often proved to be in serious default, when, without the light of economic principle, they undertake as directors the management of large ones which are out of their routine habits. They may know their own business well enough, but it is often an erroneous assumption that because directors of large concerns are men of business in common trades, they know the large new busi-ness to which they give incidental attention under new conditions. As an example of the mistakes made by them, it may be mentioned that in the formation of the Liverpool and Manchester Railway, mainly for goods traffic, the men of business who had the direction of the adjacent canal property, believed and declared that the new railway would be utterly ruinous to their business; and they pleaded before a committee of the House of Lords that it would throw out of use 800 horses, and would be detrimental to agriculture by lessening the demand for their feed. They succeeded in making heavy exactions to buy off their opposition. In their fright, after the formation of the railway, they reduced their charges for conveyance to one-fifth, on coals for instance from 2s. 6d. to 6d. per ton for about twenty miles, the result of which was that they have been surprised by such a de-velopment of traffic, that, as I am told, they have now upwards of 4,000 horses to work it, and such an augmentation of net profits as they never had in their lives before, proving that in their whole lives previously they had been in error. In London the gas companies charged 8s., 12s., and even 14s. per 1,000 cubic feet of gas; the prime cost being proved to be about 1s. 9d., or with the allowance for leakage in the distribution about 2s. 6d. Parliamentary intervention was obtained in the interest of the consumers to enforce a reduction of tion to 4s. 6d. All the practical men of business, the directors and the officers of all the gas companies believed and swore that on the proposed conditions such prices could never pay, and that the result of their adoption would be their ruin. Yet on those same conditions, with prices that their rum. Yet on those same conditions, with prices that average only one-third of what they were, the works are productive of such good dividends that an agitation appears to be getting up in some districts to enforce a still further reduction of the price, with a not improbable further im-

provement of their profits if it succeed.

Before I quit the subject of reduced charges for passenger traffic, it is right that I should mention their public impor-tance as a means of promoting the circulation of labour. During the cotton famine the glut of unemployed labour would have had much early and important relief, had cheap railway transit been available. At the instance of Earl Fortescue, farmers and others in Devon found work in Devonshire for a number of the cotton workers, and the measure, so far as it went, succeeded completely. But the excessive cost of railway transit was a serious impediment to It is true the railway authorities reduced the fares onehalf, but the work was done in such a way as to make the conveyance occupy two days instead of one, and to cost as much as if the full fare had been paid.

I find it necessary to introduce the subject of public tele-graphy here, as being an integral part of a complete railway system of communication, and as being a necessary means of working it with safety. In Germany the arrival and passage of each train is telegraphed from station to station, as two trains are not allowed to occupy one section of a line at the same time.* Captain Galt states in his report on the foreign railways that on each train there is a conductor who has charge of the train, and that "in Prussia he invariably carries a portable electric telegraph by means of which, in case of accident, he can communicate by the line wires to the next station." But in England, generally, the telegraph is not a part of the regular railway machinery, and the "line wires" are held as an independent source of private profit, obstructive of its most importent uses. Mr. Roebuck has himself organised a private telegraph company for the conveyance of messages throughout Lancashire at sixpence conveyance or messages of twenty words, and he expresses a confident belief, founded on his own practice, that by the saving of establishment charges and cheaper manipulations, using cheaper and simpler instruments, "a universal telegraph post of threepence for twenty words would pay, and pay well, by making telegraph universally accepted by all olasses.

(To be continued.)

MANCHESTER LAW ASSOCIATION.

The annual general meeting of the members of the as-The annual general meeting of the memorial structure association was held on Friday, the 13th day of January, at their rooms, No. 4, Norfolk-street, when an account of the receipts and disbursements (previously audited by two of the members) was submitted and passed.

The report, of which the following is an outline, was read

by the honorary secretary, and unanimously adopted.

During the past year little change has occurred in the number of members of the association, and its funds continue to be in a prosperous state.

Very few of the Acts passed during the last session possess any general interest for the profession, although, during its course, several important measures came under the consideration of the committee.

Judgments Law Amendment Act .- This important measure, almost the only one really affecting the profession which marks the session, has at last, owing to the perseverence of Mr. Hadfield, M.P., received the assent of Parliament. Its object is to assimilate the law of freehold, copyhold, and leasehold estate to that of pure personalty, in respect of future judgments, &c. Your committee presented a petition in favour of the bill, and Mr. Heelis was examined in support of it before the select committee of the House of Commons, to whom the bill was referred, and his evidence is printed along with the report of the committee. mittee.

The other bills which received the attention of the committee and passed into law were—"The Leases and Sales of Settled Estates Act Amendment Act," "The Improvement of Land Act." "The Railway Companies Powers Act," and

"The Railway Construction Facilities Act."

Among the bills of real importance to the profession, which claimed, though unsuccessfully, the attention of Parliament, were—"The Partnership Law Amendment Bill," "The County Courts Acts Amendments Bill," "The Courts of Justice Site Bill," "The Courts of Justice Money Bill," "The Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration, &c.,

The Partnership Law Amendment Bill was withdrawn, with a view, it is believed, to its re-introduction as a Government measure in the approaching session.

The County Courts Acts Amendment Bill, which was introduced by the Lord Chancellor, proposed many important and objectionable changes in the present state of the law, and in consequence of the opposition shown to it in various quarters, was ultimately withdrawn.

Concentration of Courts of Justice.—Two bills for this purpose were brought before Parliament at a late period of the session. Your committee presented petitions in favour of both bills to the House of Commons; they had, however, been brought forward too late in the session, and were withdrawn by the Attorney-General, who said he should reintroduce them early next session, in anticipation of which, a deputation from your association has been appointed to obtain an interview with the Members for Manchester, Salford, and South Lancashire, to request their support when again before the House.

Attorneys and Solicitors Remuneration,-This subject, which was first started by the meagre provisions in the mis-cellaneous Bill introduced by the Lord Chancellor, promises cellaneous Bill introduced by the Lord Chancellor, promises to result in an improvement upon the method by which solicitors are at present remunerated. The Liverpool Law Society drew up and forwarded to the Lord Chancellor a letter containing many valuable suggestions. In his reply his Lordship proposed their communicating with other law societies, and expressed his own wish to be "auxiliary in removing the unjust subjects of complaint which exist in the unfair regulations that now injuriously affect the profession." * Your committee forwarded to the Incorporated fession." Your committee forwarded to the Incorporated Law Society a series of remarks upon the practical "suggestions" prepared by them, and proposed that representatives from the principal provincial law associations should meet the special committee of the Incorporated Society, to discuss the whole question. This proposal the council of the Incorporated Law Society are making arrangements to

Law of Bankruptcy. - The House of Commons having appointed a select committee to consider the amendments re quired in this branch of the law, your committee agreed upon various suggestions, which were incorporated, along with those of other law societies, in a petition presented to the House by the Metropolitan and Provincial Law Association. The select committee broke up without making any report, though it is understood that the basis of one was agreed to, which will probably be adopted by a reconstitution

of the same committee next session.

Assizes,-Your committee would congratulate the members of the Association and the profession generally, on the fact that the past year has witnessed the establishment of assizes in Manchester. Your committee, however, regret that the Hundred of Salford was not allowed to derive the full benefit of the splendid accommodation provided for the purpose, by the holding of a winter civil assize. Your committee are prepared to take active measures in urging upon intitee are prepared to take active measures in arging upon the attention of Her Majesty's Government the unanimous feeling which prevails throughout the Hundred, that a winter civil assize in this City is necessary and ought to be

Amalgamation of Courts of Record .- Your committee exceedingly regret that their exertions for amalgamating the two courts of Manchester and Salford have failed.

The committee trust, however, that at some future time the advisability of combining the two courts may be gener-ally admitted by all parties, and that the desired amalgama-

tion may take place.

Common Pleas at Lancaster.—The answers to the circulars issued to the members of the profession throughout the Hundred of Salford enable your committee to state, that the business which will be brought to the Manchester Registry of the Common Pleas at Lancaster, if established, will be amply sufficient to meet all its expenses.

It is expected that the Liverpool Law Society will be in a position shortly to join your committee in seeking another interview with the Chancellor of the Duchy, for the purpose of again urging upon his attention the establishment of dis-trict registries both in Manchester and Liverpool.

Preliminary Examinations of Articled Clerks.-These examinations continue to be conducted in Manchester, under the superintendence of members of the association.

A deputation from your association attended the annua provincial meeting of the Metropolitan and Provincial Law • 9 Sol. Jour. 35.

[•] This plan is adopted on the southern division of the London and orth Western, and, we believe, on some other English lines.— North W ED. S. J.

Association, which took place at Leeds, in the month of October last.

AMALGAMATION OF COURTS OF RECORD.

Copy Suggestions of the Manchester Law Association, for Carrying out the Scheme.

It is suggested-

That the Amalgamated Court be called "The Court of Record for the city of Manchester and Hundred of Salford."*
That the offices of the Amalgamated Court be in some cen-

tral position in Manchester, and that the sittings of the Court for the trial of issues be held in Manchester once a

That a judge with an adequate salary be appointed by the

Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.

That the office and dignity of the Earl of Sefton, as steward of the Hundred of Salford, be in no way affected, and that the fees or remuneration payable to him be the subject of future arrangement.

That the present registrar of the Salford Hundred Court be paid a retiring pension, upon a principle of calculation to

be hereafter arranged.

That the appointment of the registrar and inferior officers of the Amalgamated Court shall be vested in the Manchester Corporation.

CORK LAW SOCIETY - SOLICITORS' ANNUAL LICENSE.

A deputation from the council of this society waited, last week, on Mr. N. D. Murphy, M.P., the new representative for the city, to solicit his influence in Parliament for the removal of this impost.

The deputation having been introduced,

Mr. Noblett, the president, (advancing to Mr. Murphy) said—Sir, it gives me great gratification to wait on you with the present deputation, to solicit your aid, as a member of the Imperial Parliament, in a matter that, I think, you will admit to be most legitimate. I would be doing an injustice to myself and my brethren if I did not avail myself of this opportunity of congratulating you in your present position. I do believe, and I speak the sentiment of my profession, that we never returned a man better calculated to be a useful and efficient member for the city than yourself; as I know, from long experience and close observation there is not a man more thoroughly competent and more willing to discharge the business duties that will devolve on you, and to assert and support them better than you are. The subject-matter of this meeting is, simply to solicit your aid as a member of Parliament, in trying to get our body freed from an obnoxious impost, that all consider derogatory and some degrading. We care very little about the financial pressure of that impost, but as a body of educated gentlemen, we think it most but it as a boy of educated general, we think it most humiliating that we should be obliged to pay a tax that members of other professions—the medical profession, the engineers, and the bar—are exempted from paying. Several years ago the repeal of this tax was attempted, and our society is now resolved to present to Parliament a petition for its repeal, and to introduce a measure founded on the principle of Lord Robert Grosvenor's Bill. The entire annual income paid by attorneys is estimated at about £80,000.

Mr. Murphy.-Does that amount include what is paid in

Scotland ?

Mr. Noblett,-Yes; I should say in the entire kingdom so much is paid annually by the members of our profession, and why the members of the other learned professions are excluded

from any impost, I cannot imagine.

Mr. Murphy.—The impost was raised for an exceptional purpose and in exceptional times. Those times have passed by, and I do not understand why the impost should be

Mr. Lane said that a meeting of members was held a short time since, at which the views of a great many members of the profession were stated at great length, and resolutions were founded on those views, and unanimously agreed to. Those views were in accordance with the opinions just ex-

pressed by their president.

Mr. Bass said that when Lord Robert Grosvenor introduced his bill into Parliament, the resistance made to the demand of the profession was merely a financial one. He was quite sure that the honourable gentleman's able advocacy in the house would be of vast importance to the members of the

This is a similar title to that of the Manchester District Probate

profession, in their endeavours to get rid of so obnoxious a

Mr. J. W. Bourke, Mr. Wm. O'Keefe, and Mr. Gregg,

also made some observations.

Mr. Murphy, M.P., in reply to the deputation, said that he believed that it was not intended by the government to defend the imposition of the tax as just and proper. The tax was imposed at an exceptional time—in the time of the American war. Other imposts were levied at the same time, all of which have been repealed, and he could not understand why the impost on solicitors was not also repealed. He did not conceive that it could be looked on in the light of a degradation, and it was his opinion that when the tax was orignally imposed there was no opposition offered to it, because it was considered that it would exclude certain persons and make the profession more respectable. The order of the day then was "monopoly," and it was supposed that the impost now complained of would make the profession exclusive. He should exert all his influence for the sake of the profession, and he had much reason to be proud of their good opinion; and he had no doubt that the subject respecting which the deputa-tion had waited on him, would be placed before the Chan-cellor of the Exchequer, and before Parliament, in a manner to entitle for it the most favourable consideration.

The interview then terminated.

LAW REPORTING. No. III.

(Continued from p. 245.)
CAUSES OF OUR BAD REPORTS.

In former numbers we have stated that in the best reporters a report has three distinct divisions—a statement of the case, a report of the arguments of counsel, and a report of the judgment; and that this judgment is an opinion pure; that is to say, an opinion without any attempt to state the case, or to report the arguments. We have also shown that in many reports, especially the late ones, there is no statement by the reporter at all, nor any report by him oftentimes of the arguments of counsel; that, in fact, "the judgment" constitutes the whole report; the judge stating all the facts that are stated, and rehearsing all the arguments

that are presented.

This peculiar form may be traced to specific causes. And primary among them is, in numerous, though by no means in all cases, the gross incompetence of the reporters themselves, including their want of sufficient study of the cases and want of sufficient attendance in court during the arguments. We have said that there is no such "vast intellectual power" nor any such "deep professional learning" required to report a law case, and this is true. Still, the reporter's seat is not the place pre-eminently suited for a fool; as many fools, from the zeal with which they would rush into it, appear to think it is. The office has real duties. To be well filled it requires some of the best qualities of the professional mind, and some habits which, though not of the kind strictly professional, must necessarily attend them. The union of the two is not universal. Certainly the office requires, as a preliminary, good education and knowledge in the law, constant attendance in court, good study of the papers during and after argument;* intelligent apprehension of the argument on both sides, and, above all, a thorough understanding and mental possession of the judgment itself. In these things intellectual qualities of any order much inferior will not suffice; nor habits of business either indolent or careless. Nothing material must be overlooked; nothing not material should be given. Yet all this is but preliminary. There is requisite, as literary qualification, power, first of all, in presenting the case—presenting it, I mean, so as to give to its different parts their place, proportion, and effect. In narrating there must always be order and con-densation; and both must be accompanied by exactness and elegance of expression, such as are not the possession of all good thinkers, nor of all good lawyers, nor even of all educated men. At times, indeed, as we have already mentioned, something of the artist's skill is almost necessary. Not every good lawyer, therefore, is competent to fill such a post. The professional drudge will do nothing but disgrace it. Neither is the mere scholar a sufficient person.

* The old and excellent reporter Edmund Plowden, tells his reader that before the case came to be argued, he had copies made of the record, and took pains to study the points of law arising thereupon; so that if he had been "put to it, he was ready to have argued when the first man began."

Then comes the syllabus, placitum, or marginal abstract. This, though formally no part of the case itself, is, practically, the most important part of the report. It is, as it were, the docket entry of the judgment upon which we rely for notice of the judgment, and are justified it relying. We may add that, in the hands of an able reporter, the marginal note may serve, and ought to serve, a higher purpose than convenience of reference. In reading a written opinion, even when we have the case well stated in advance, we are sometimes at a loss to know precisely what is the gist of a judgment, and what remarks are only inducement or surplusage. A reporter who has attended the argument ascertains what are the points on which the judgment hinges; and it is his duty to announce at the head of his case-not every dictum, every truth which the judge may have used for illustration, for argument, for analogy—but that one point or those points which alone it was understood by the Court that it really decided. Accordingly, it is not uncommon to find the marginal note of an able and conscientious reporter of repute, a reporter like Burrow, or Durnford, or East, or Binney, or Johnson, or Metcalfe, or Gray, referred to when a judgment is ambiguous or obscure, as the evidence of what the Court did, in fact, decide.

Now, in the American States, the office of reporter rarely affords any inducement, pecuniary or official—present or prospective—to men of abilities to devote themselves to it. Herein it is unlike that in the higher English courts. In England, many reporters have reached high judicial station, even the highest, and some chiefly from their merits as reporters. The names of Lord Campbell, Baron Alderson, Sir Edward Hyde East Chief Justice of India, Sir J. B. Bosanquet, Sir W. H. Maule, Sir W. E. Taunton, Sir Charles Crompton, Sir Cresswell Cresswell, Sir Colin Blackburn, and in Ireland, of that excellent reporter Lord Chief Justice Lefroy—with others probably in both countries, whose names do not occur to us-attest that the Crown has never confined with the "outside world that the genius of the bar lies in a a speech, and not in thought or writing;" a great mistake, as it is truly called by one who has risen to the highest eminence in departments alike of speech, and thought, and writing; a mistake, however, far too common in America. Lord St. Leonard's, himself the dispenser in two countries Lord St. Leonard's, himself the dispenser in two countries of kingly gifts, has announced the principle on which the Crown of England has acted. "The profession," says this great chancellor and peer, "owes a debt of gratitude to those members of the bar, who, with knowledge, ability, and labour, dedicate themselves to reporting. And in dispensing legal patronage long-continued labours of a reporter should not be overlooked."

In the American States few men of the requisite talents and accomplishments will devote themselves to reporting at all; or, if so directing their talents, will direct them with that all; or, it so directing their talents, will direct them with that steadiness which the duty to be well discharged necessarily requires. In some of the supreme courts there the reporters have been supreme fools; asin over asinis. The result is that everywhere throughout the country judges report themselves. They are afraid to trust the reporters with that exact duty that is theirs alone. The feeling is natural. It is as old at least as Lord Holt, who when presented absurdly by one of the authors of it Negery Provents is a reversely the versile. of the authors of "Modern Reports," is reported to have said +

"See the inconvenience of these scrambling properts! They will make us appear to posterity for a parcel of blockheads."
Judges, we say, are thus compelled in the United States
to be their own chroniclers. But it is not the duty of a judge to report. On the contrary, as I have said, his duty is unfavourable to the business. More than this: his duty—which is to declare the law irrespectively of what may be thought of such declaration—is not quite consistent with any office which states the case and presents the argument; an office which, according as it is exercised in one way or in another, can make any wrong opinion appear right or any right one wrong.

Then there is a reporter who ought to do it all. And thus it comes that, between a reporter of some kind, and a re-porter of a kind not good, on the one side, and a judge who dares not trust him and does not displace him on the other, we are overwhelmed with reports; one-half or some greater or less fraction by the reporter, and one-half or some greater or less fraction by the court; and so, as further consequence,

it is that with courts composed of very able judges and a bar which as a whole is full of power, the reports of judicial proceedings throughout the country are a burden to the profession and a scandal to the land; and that British writers quoting our own, treat as even unworthy of the reviewers notice the "trash that has been published in this way;" "compiled," as they declare it all to be, by reporters "utterly incompetent" for their work.*

2. Judgments in the English courts are ordinarily given immediately after the cases are argued. The argument being ended the judges consult a moment, and if a majority are agreed, no cur, adv, vult, is entered; the court delivers itself at once. No facts need be re-stated. They have just been stated at the bar, and are fresh in the minds of every one. No argument need be rehearsed. The sound of the one on which the operation would be performed has not yet died in the hearer's ears. The "judgment," of course, is opinion

In the States, however, judgments are seldom giving except after consultation among the judges, and sometimes not until weeks have elapsed. Hence, the judge to whom the case is "assigned" has to re-study it from the records, and, in order that even his brethren on the bench may understand it, he has to re-state the case more or less ab ovo ad malum.

3. Judgments in the English courts, generally speaking, are given orally; in America they are almost universally written; and to this, in combination with the frequently written; and to this, in combination with the frequently incompetent or indolent character of the reporter, is due, I apprehend, one great cause, of bad reports. The reporter of an unwritten judgment, while of course he gives the substance of what the Court has said, has a vast discretion as to the maner of doing it. That which, though proper, from special reasons, to have been said he deems not necessary to be reported, he reports not. All arguments of the Court by which it establishes facts only—or in other words, by which it settles the case, are omitted wholly:—the case which it settles the case, are omitted wholly;—the case itself being assumed. Facts which the reporter means to state in the case, he omits from the judgment as printed, even though in the judgment as spoken, facts may have been recited fully. Hence the judgment, however actually given, comes out pure when appearing in print. It is "opinion" after "argument" upon a "case." In America, however, the opinion is written. It is even sometimes recorded. The reporter feels, naturally, some reluctance to touch it in any manner whatsoever. The judge may be unwilling that he any manner whatsoever. The judge may be unwilling that he should touch it; unwilling, sometimes, through a proper fear of the reporter's capacity, sometimes through motives of an amour propre, which ermine is not found to mortify of an amour propre, which ermine is not found to mortify and kill within us more than cloth, or "carpe," or "lawn." Hence, most written judgments are printed just as they were delivered. The reporter conceives that he has no discretion; that in printing the judgments he is in some sort certifying to a transcript. Accordingly finding the facts stated to a greater or less extent by the Court, and thinking that all which is thus stated must be printed, and printed not only in substance, but in time and in manner also, as it was additional the certificial to the printed for the printed f delivered, he omits, himself, to state in the beginning of the report that which the judge who delivers judgment would only be repeating, when he comes towards its close. And as the arguments of counsel without a preceding case are useless, they follow the reporter's statement and go over-board with it. We shall advert further to this one great cause of bad reports when we come to speak of the remedy for them.

The special form of bad reports which we have pointed out, belongs chiefly, though by no means exclusively, to the United States. But the reports of England, the States, and Canada, have one feature in common that largely impairs the value of all. We refer to reports of cases not worth reporting. Nearly fifty years ago, Daniel Webster, reviewing the then published volumes of Mr. Wheaton, wrote as follows :- ;

wrote as follows:—‡

"The rage for book-making has infected this, as well
as other things, and there is now, especially from the
English press, somewhat of a redundancy of reports. It
arises from the growing habit of reporting cases not sufficiently important to merit publicity. This is a great and

^{*}Answer to the circular issued by the Bar Committee on Law Reporting, Jurist, Vol. xv. N. S., p. 323, American Edit,
† Slater v. May, 2 Lord Raymond, 1071.

^{*} Upper Canada Law Journal, vol. x., p. 65; March, 1864, quoting

[•] Upper Canada Law Journal, vol. A., p. 65; anaton, vol. p. 65; the New York Transcrip.
† I am speaking, of course, of good reporters and not of bad ones; of whom there is a class sufficiently large, with specimens in the class, abundantly, in imperfections, perfect.
‡ A. D. 1818, North American Review, vol. viii, p. 68.

increasing evil, and, unless checked, may be deeply injurious to the profession and the public. It has not been so in former times. Nearly all the reported opinions of the King's Bench, during Lord Mansfield's time, are contained in Burrow, Cow-per, Douglass, a few cases in Lofft, and the two first volumes of Term Reports. This extends over a period of thirty-two Lord Ellenborough has been on the bench only since years. Lord Ellenborough has been on the bench only since 1802; and yet more than twenty volumes of reports from that court have appeared since he has presided in it. The consequence is just what would be expected. Almost every case in Douglass, Cowper, and Burrow, is a useful one. The later volumes of the Term Reports, many of those of Mr. East, and of Maule and Selwyn, are filled with cases almost useless, and in this country entirely so. It is our duty, as far as possible, to repress a similar redundency in our own country. The processing is head to the country of the state of the country of the processing is head to the country. country. The profession is bound to interfere with its remonstrance."

If these remarks of the great Webster had force fifty years ago, and were suggested when reviewing a volume of Mr. Wheaton's creditable series, what is to be said now now, when we are overwhelmed by the never-ending still-beginning issues of the law press;—the immensus aliarum super alias accreatarum legum cumulus. The evil, "great and increasing," even in Webster's middle life, has not been checked; and it has been, as he declared in his great forecast, that it would be "deeply injurious to the profession and to the public." Useful precedents, and valuable learning lie fathom deep under rubbish whose piles no one can clear away; and in some of the courts judges neither know, nor, from the immensity of reports, can know, what it is that those before them—those whose judgments they are bound to follow—have decided. This is a great professional and public nuisance. The evil is one of those now bitterly complained of in England, and it exists to such a degree that weekly journals—in their nature and now, when we are overwhelmed by the never-ending stillof those now bitterly complained of in England, and it exists to such a degree that weekly journals—in their nature and from their form of publication, largely deciduous—have much superseded regular volumes as the channel of publication. "The booksellers," says Lord St. Leonards', * "have so managed that after a lawyer has half-bound his reports, he finds the value in his hands not largely exceeding the cost of binding.'

In the next number of our series—now almost at its end—we shall consider how the system which we have been speaking of, of sending the reader to the judgment for the case, operates on the law as a science of precedents.

LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL.

LAW LECTURES AT THE INCORPORATED LAW SOCIETY.

Mr. M. H. Cookson, on Equity, Monday, March 6. Mr. H. Shield, on Common Law and Mercantile Law. Friday, March 10.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY. At the meeting of this society on Tuesday, the 28th February, Mr. Addison in the chair, the following question was discussed, viz. :- "Can a reversionary interest be created in chattels personal? Hoare v. Parker, 2 Term Rep. 376; Tancred v. Allgood, 28 L. J. Ex. 362, 1 Jarm. on Wills, 2nd ed. 747, Wms. Pers. 5th ed. 236."

Mr. Winch opened the question in the affirmative, which was the view adopted by the society by a small majority.

COURT PAPERS.

COMMON LAW BUSINESS AT THE JUDGES CHAM-BERS.

Common Pleas Chambers, 1st March, 1865.
The following regulations for transacting the business at these Chambers will be strictly observed till further notice :-

Acknowledgments of deeds will be taken at a quarter past ten o'clock.

Original summonses to be placed on the file. Summonses adjourned by the judge will be heard at half

past ten o'clock.

Summonses of the day will be called and numbered at a quarter before eleven o'clock, and heard consecutively.

The parties on two summonses only will be allowed to at-

tend in the judges room at the same time.

* The Jurist, N. S., p. 25.

All long orders to be left that they may be ready on being applied for the following day.

Counsel will be heard at two o'clock. The name of the

cause in which counsel are engaged to be put on the counsel

Affidavits in support of ex parte applications for judges orders (except those for orders to hold to bail), to be left the day before the orders are to be applied for, except under special circumstances; such affidavits to be properly indorsed with the names of the parties, the nature of the application, and a reference to the statute under which any application is made, the party being prepared to produce the same.

All affidavits read or referred to before the judge must be indorsed and filed.

N.B. The summonses will be made returnable at a quarter past ten o'clock, and will be attended for the half hour in the Exchequer Hall, where they will be called over and numbered at a quarter before eleven o'clock, and heard consecutively.

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

EQUITY AND LAW LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

The annual general meeting of this society was held on Tuesday, the 21st February, 1865, at the Society's House, No. 18, Lincoln's-inn-fields, London, W.C. George Lake Russell, Esq. in the chair.

The report of the directors for the twentieth year of the

society's existence stated that the rate of progress exhibited in the accounts of former years has been more than main-

In the course of the year 190 new policies were issued, insuring the sum of £308,645; and the premiums received thereon amounted to £10,666 4s. 4d. These figures exhibit a large increase in every respect upon preceding years, and the directors have the greatest satisfaction in pointing out that this increased business has not been obtained by an increased scale of expenditure, whether in the matter of advertisements, payment of commission, or agencies; but is the gradual result of the growth of the society in public fayour, consequent on a wider knowledge of the substantial advantages it offers.

The total income of the year was £93,369 6s. 9d., and the outgoings of every description £46,047 17s. 2d. The assets have been increased by the difference, £47,321 9s. 7d., which is a larger sum than has ever previously been carried

over.

The claims have been heavier than usual; but are still considerably below the amount which might fairly have been expected. Twenty deaths have occurred among the lives assured, by which claims have arisen under twenty-seven policies to the extent of £26,503 15s. 9d. The loss of the society has been reduced to £23,003 15s. 9d. by the receipt from other companies of £3,500 under reassurances. Twentytwo of the policies insuring £19,000 were entitled to profits; and the bonus additions thereon amounted to £2,053 16s. 9d. The average amount of the losses by death during the four years, 1860 to 1863, was £11,930; and it will be noticed that the losses of 1864 are very nearly double that amount. This affords a good illustration of the advantage of the practice adopted by this society of making its divisions of profits at intervals of five years rather than more fre-

The following directors retire by rotation :- Mr. Hollings-

worth, Mr. Dimond, Mr. Robins, and Mr. Hawkins.
The directors regret to record the death of Mr. Senior, who for so many years was chairman of the society, and was one of its oldest members.

The retiring auditors are Mr. Ellis Clowes, for the pro-prietors, and Mr. Templer for the assured.

It will be in the recollection of the proprietors that the time has now arrived for the fourth quinquennial division of profits. The calculations for the purpose are now in progress, but must occupy some months. The result, however, will be communicated to all parties interested as soon as practi-

Considering the great progress of the society in the now closed quinquennial period, the directors cannot doubt that the bonus to be declared in the course of the present year will be at least as satisfactory as the former ones.

PROVIDENT LIFE OFFICE.

The annual meeting of this company was held on Monday last. The report stated the invested capital to be £1,660,447,

the annual income £196,955, and the amount received for premiums upon new policies in the past year, £9,752.

NORTH BRITISH AND MERCANTILE INSURANCE COMPANY. In the report to the shareholders, on the 6th March next,

the directors of this company express their satisfaction at the increased amount of business transacted during the past year. The fire premiums received were net £219,235 10s. 8d., being £54,043 2s. 5d. in excess of the preceding year.

In the life department, 1,240 policies were issued, assuring £1,034,578, the premiums on which amount to £31,895.

In the annuity department, 31 bonds were issued, securing yearly £1,646 14s. 2d., for which the company received £19,858 14s. 5d., while 34 annuities, amounting to £854 14s. 6d. annually, fell in.

The total revenue from all sources, is £565,458 16s. 2d.
The losses by fire were heavy, amounting to £183,506 18s. 6d., the past year having proved unusually disastrous in the experience of all fire insurance companies. The claims on life policies were considerably below the company's expecta-

The total amount of funds in reserve, to meet contingencies, is £256,762 15s. 9d., and the Company's assets now amount to £2,304,512 7s. 10d.

The payment of the usual dividend of 10 per cent. is recommended.

VARNA RAILWAY COMPANY.

In consequence of representations having been made to the directors of the Varna Railway Company that the time for receiving applications was too limited, the last day for applications is extended to Tuesday, the 7th March, for London, and Wednesday, the 8th March, at 12 o'clock, for the country.

ENGLISH FUNDS AND RAILWAY STOCK. LAST QUOTATION, March 2, 1865. [From the Official List of the actual business transacted.] GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 88	1
Ditto for Account, 887	-
3 per Cent. Reduced, 8	71 x.d.
New 3 per Cent., 871	•
Do. 34 per Cent., Jan.	94
Do. 21 per Cent., Jan.	94 71
Do. 5 per Cent., Jan.	
Ammition Ton 190	

NAT FUNDS.

Annuities, April, '85, —
Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1908 —
Ex Bills, 21000, 6 per Ct. 6 pm
Ditto, £300, Do. par 6 pm
Ditto, £300, Do. pm
Bank of England Stock, 52 per
Ct. (last half-year), 245
Ditto for Account,

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES. INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ditto for Account, — '74, 218 | Ind. Enf. Pr., 5 p C., Jan. '72, 1024 | Ditto for Account, — Ditto 5 per Cent., July, '76, 1035 | Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent., Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '88 — Ditto, ditto, Certificates, — Ditto Enfaced Ppr., 4 per Cent. — Ditto, ditto, under £1000, pm

RAILWAY STOCK.

Shares.	Railways.		Closing Prices	
Stock	Bristol and Exeter		94	
Stock	Caledonian	100	1324	
Stock	Edinburgh and Glasgow	100	87	
Stock	Glasgow and South-Western	100	109	
Stock	Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	461	
Stock	Do., East Anglian Stock, No. 2	100	8	
Stock	Great Northern	100	1284 x.d.	
Stock	Do., A Stock*	100	142 x.d.	
Stock	Do., B Stock	100	130 x.d.	
Stock	Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	90	
Stock	Great Western-Original	100	739	
Stock	Do., West Midland-Oxford	100	50	
Stock	Do., doNewport	100	49	
Stock	Do., do.—Hereford	100	104	
Stock	Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	114 x.d.	
Stock	London and Blackwall	100	86 x.d.	
Stock	London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	104	
Stock	London, Chatham, and Dover	100	39	
Stock	London and North-Western	100	117 x.d.	
Stock	London and South-Western	100	964 x.d.	
Stock	Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	601	
Stock	Metropolitan	100	118	
10		£4:10	61	
Stock	Midland	100	1313x.d.&n.	
Stock	Do., Birmingham and Derby	100	103 x.d.&n.	
Stock	North British	100	53	
Stock	North London	100	120 x.d.	
10	Do., New, 1864	5	61 x.d.	
Stock	North Staffordshire	100	79 x.d.&n.	
Stock	Scottish Central	100	142	
Stock	South Devon	100	58	
Stock	South-Eastern	100	841 x.d.	
Stock	Taff Vale	100	158 x d.	
10	Do., C	3	4 x.d.	
Stock	Vale of Neath	100	111	
Stock	West Cornwall	100	40	

[·] A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR AND BANKRUPTCY REFORM. A deputation of gentlemen from the Association of Chambers of Commerce of the United Kingdom waited upon the Lord Chancellor lately, for the purpose of presenting a memorial on the subject of the law of bankruptcy reform,

The Lord Chancellor said he was of opinion that a radical change was required in the law of bankruptcy. The law undertook to give a bankrupt a discharge from all his debts, but it should do no such thing. from all his debts, but it should do no such thing, the multiplied the costs, and made the Court of Bank-ruptey an instrument for fraud. That arose from the fact of there being imprisonment for debt. People revolted from the idea of imprisonment for debt, and they well the fact to go the fact of the fact undertook to see that a man could get his discharge under certain conditions, and that opened the door for the evils of which they complained, the result being that the Court of Bankruptcy offered great opportunities for fraud. He proposed to abolish imprisonment for debt, and to devote Bankruptey Court to its legitimate purpose—to collect the estate of a bankrupt, and distribute it pro rata among the creditors, the bankrupt to be left to get his discharge from the creditors. He proposed to introduce an alteration of the present laws affecting solicitors and attorneys. At present they could not undertake any business for a lump sum. He proposed to give them a specified sum. He would make the penal law much more severe. He should like to know if they would leave to creditors the power of dealing with an estate in their own the power of ceaning with an estate in their own mode. He would leave a debtor to get his own discharge from the creditors, emancipating him from a prison, but leaving him to his last penny at the mercy of any of his creditors, until they gave him a discharge. The judge of a bankruptcy court should have plenary jurisdiction.

Sir F. Crossley said, if he understood rightly, when an estate

was distributed, and it did not realise twenty shillings in the pound, and the bankrupt commenced business again, every shilling he made might be taken by the creditors.

Lord Chancellor replied in the affirmative; but, in the case of misfortune arising from shipwreck or a fire, he might

safely trust the bankrupt to the mercy of English creditors.
Mr. Lloyd said the Chambers of Commerce would reply
to the observations of the Lord Chancellor in a memorial at a future time.

Wills.—A very large portion of the business of the court is provided by wills. In the majority of cases, where testais provided by wills. In the majority of cases, where testators make their own wills, or have them prepared by incompetent persons, they unconsciously provide food for the lawyers. To save a few pounds in his lifetime, a testator will often deprive his children and legatees of hundreds after his death. It is an old saying, and a true one, that the village schoolmaster and the parish clerk are the lawyers' best friends. Nearly every one thinks himself competent to draw a will, a document which requires more skill and caution in its propagation than any other that could be named. Even in its preparation than any other that could be named. Even lawyers themselves who draw their own wills often make mistakes. Sir Samuel Romilly's will was improperly worded, and that of Chief Baron Thompson the subject of Chancery proceedings. The will of Bradley, the celebrated conveyancer, a man who spent all his life in drawing other people's wills, was set aside by Lord Thurlow for uncertainty; and a late learned Master in Chancery directed the proceeds of his estate to be invested in Consols in his own name! Not long ago an application had to be made to the Probate Court in consequence of a testator having supposed that the word executrix was the plural of executor—the same individual, by the way, talked of "provoking" all former wills! In another case a man left some property to his nephew John, when he had two nephews of that name, and a suit in chancery was instituted for the purpose of ascertaining which of the nephews the testator meant to benefit; and "once upon ' a country attorney, who had, perhaps, a spite against his relations, left eleven hundred pounds to three gentlemen, his executors, to appropriate eight hundred pounds "as the might think proper;" for which arduous task he bequeathed them one hundred pounds each. "Wills," said Lord Coke, and the construction of them, do more to perplex a man than any other, and to make a certain construction of them exceedeth jurisprudentium artem.—Chambers' Journal.

A BISHOP IN COURT.—Curious details are met with in the Lombardia, respecting the appearance of Mgr. Speranza, bishop of Bergamo, before a court, for having attacked, in a pastoral address, the institutions of the state. The prelate presented himself before the judge with a numerous suite of priests and servants in livery, after having, as he ascended the staircase of the Palais de Justice, distributed abundant benedictions to the employés and others whom he met on his way. He at once protested against the violence which had been done him, and admonished the judge, the attorney-general, and the clerk of the court, that they had all three incurred the penalty of the greater excommunication, for citing before a secular authority a prelate of the Holy Church. The proceedings have not vet terminated.

ESTATE EXCHANGE REPORT.

AT THE GUILDHALL HOTEL.

Feb. 22.—By Messrs, EDWIN FOX & BOUSFIELD.

Leasehold residence with gardens, known as "Wilton House," situate in Shooters Hill-road, Blackheath; let on lease at £120 per annum: term, 93 years unexpired; ground rent, £12 10s. per annum-Sold for £1,310.

Feb. 23.-By Mr. MARSH.

Freehold cottage, situate in Heyworth-road, Forest-lane, Stratford-Sold

for £185. Leasehold residence, being No. 6, The Villas, Erith, Kent, term 96 years from 1857; ground-rent £10 per annum—Sold for £785. Feb. 24.—By Mr. Frank Lewis. An annuity of £500 per annum, payable out of estates situate in York-shire, during the lives of a lady and gentleman aged 45 and 50 years—

saire, during the rives of a lady and gentleman aged 49 and 50 years—
Sold for £11,200.

easehold residence, known as Colebrook House, situate No. 29, Highbury
New Park; term 94 years from 1855; ground-rent £15 15s, per annum
—Sold for £1,700.

AT GARRAWAY'S.

Feb. 24.—By Messrs. Glasier & Sons.

Leasehold house, being No. 5, Munster-street, Regent's-park, with ground and premises in the rear; term 58 years unexpired; ground-rent £6 2x. 6d. per annum—Sold for £2.660.
Leasehold Improved rental of £170,per annum, for 11 years, arising from houses situate in Victoria-street, Westminster—Sold for £1,420.

house situate in victoria-street, Westminstor—Sold for £1,420.

Leasehold property, situate No. 148, Great College-street, with workshops, 2 houses in the rear, being Nos 61 and 62, College-street Weststabling, coach-house, and rooms adjoining, being No. 147, Great College-street, and a cottage garden, being No. 147a, Great College-street, and a cottage garden, being No. 147a, Great College-street, Canden-town, producing £126 8s, per annum; held by under-lease which will expire in 1889; ground-rent £25 per annum—Sold for £980.

Feb. 27.—By Mr. Whittingham.

Freehold building land, fronting Cricket-field-road, Lower Clapton—Lot
75 sold for £105—Lot 84 sold for £185—Lots 103 and 104 sold for £180

By Mr. J. WALKER,

By Mr. J. WALKER,

Leasehold wine and spirit establishment known as the Admiral Napier,
situate at the corner of Douglas-street, New Cross—Sold for £4,670.

Leasehold wine and spirit establishment, known as the Admiral Duncan
situate in New Cross-road—Sold for £3,600.

Leasehold. 4 houses, being Nos. 3 to 6, Douglas-street, New Cross, producing £96 per annum—Sold for £810.

Beneficial interest in those business premises, being No. 35, 0id Change, City; held under 2 leases for 32 years from 1864, and 303 years from 1865, at a rent of £485 per annum—Sold for £2,350.

Leasehold house, being No. 25a, Hemsworth-street, Hoxton; let at £28 per annum; term 61 years from 1847; ground-rent £3 10s, per annum—Sold for £230.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

CREE-On Feb. 18, at Bublin, the wife of George Cree, Esq., Barrister-

at-Law, of a son.
CURRAN—On Feb. 24, at Dublin, the wife of John Adye Curran, Esq.,
jun. Barrister-at-Law, of a daughter.
EDDOWES—On Feb. 23, at Derby, the wife of C. K. Eddowes, Esq., EDDOWES—On Feb. 23, at Lousy, and the Solicitor, of a son.
LOWRY—On Feb. 21, at Ballytrim House, county Down, the wife of T.
K. Lowry, Egg., Q.C., of a daughter.
WALTERS—On Feb. 20, at Ewell, Surrey, the wife of William Melmoth
Walters, Esq., Lincoln's-inn, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

MARRIAGES.

ADLARD—MAY—On Feb. 2, at St. Mary's, West Brompton. F. Adlard, Esq., High Holborn, to C. M., daughter of the late J. May, Esq., Solicitor, Bethnal-green.

COFFREY—DOBBIN—On Feb. 9, at the District Registrar's Office, Dublin, J. Richard Coffrey, Esq., to Maria, sister of J. W. Dobbin, Esq., A.M., J.C.D., Barrister-at-Law, King's-inns, Dublin, and Lincoln's-inn.

colb's-lin. CRESSWELL—MAULE—On Feb. 22, at Ulgham Church, Northumber-land, Henry B. Cresswell, Esq., to Eleanor, daughter of the late G. Maule, Esq., Solicitor H.M.S. Treasury.

EAST—HAY—On Feb. 25, at St. Michael's, Stockwell, George E. East, Esq., Staple's-lin, W. C., Solicitor, to Mary A., daughter of E. H. Hay,

Esq., Staple's-inn, W.C., Solicitor, to Mary A., daughter of E. H. Hay, Esq., Betchworth, Surey.

FLEMING—CROFTON— On Feb. 8, at Ormond Quay Presbyterian Church, Dublin, L. M. Fleming, Esq., Crewn Prosecutor for county Longford, to Lizzie Ann., youngest daughter of Marcus Louther Crofton, formerly of Liscormick, county Longford.

GIBRONS—M'GRATH—On Feb. 19, at Dublin, William Gibbons, Esq., to Martha Maria, eldest daughter of the late James M'Grath, Esq., Solicitor, Dublin.

LASCELLES—FITZWILLIAMS—On Feb. 23, at St. Mary's, Tenby, A. H. Lascelles, Esq., Narberth, to Margaret C. H., daughter of E. C. L. Fitzwilliams, Esq., Temple, E.C.

LUSHINGTON—MOWATT—On Feb. 28, at Holy Trinity Church, Westminster, V. Lushington, Esq., Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law, son of the Right Hon. Stephen Lushington, Esq., Judge of the Admiralty Court, to Jane, daughter of F. Mowatt, Esq., Eccleston-square, MERRY—WOODHOUSE—On Feb. 28, at St. John's, Notting-hill, T. R. Merry, Esq., Walton-on-Thames, to Eugenia M., widow of the late-E. G. Woodhouse, Esq., Lincoln's-inn.
O'CONNELL—BLANCOM —On Feb. 21, at the Church of the Catholic University, Morgan John O'Connell, Esq., county Clare, and the Temple, London, Barrister-at-Law, to Mary Anne, only surviving child of Charles Bianconi, Esq., D. L., Longfield, county Tipperary.
PEEL—LUDGATE—On Feb. 28, at St. George's, Hanover-square, William H., son of William Feel, Esq., Yorkshire, to Mary C., daughter of J. Ludgate, Esq., Barrister-at-Law.
PLUNKETT—LITTON—On Feb. 23, at Kingstow, Major the Honourable Edward Sidney Plankett, youngest son of the late Lord Baron Louth, of Louth, to Sophia Augusta, daughter of Edward Litton, Esq., Tyrone, late M.P. for the borough of Coleraine, one of the Masters in Chancery in Ireland. Chancery in Ireland. DEATHS.

ANDREWS—On Feb. 20, at Comber, county Down, Robert Andrews, Esq., Q.C., LL.D., Dublin, Chairman of the county Donegal. COTTEL—On Feb. 20, at London, John Berkeley Cotter, Esq., formerly of the Royal Navy, and son of the late Edward, Cotter, Esq., Solicitor,

or the Royal Navy, and son of the late Edward, Cotter, Esq., Solicitor, Bandon, aged 60.

DICKENS—On Jan. 16, T. H. Dickens, Esq., senior Magistrate of Calcutta, and son of the late T. Dickens, Esq., of the Calcutta bar. FITZGIBBON—On Feb. 28, at Dublin, William M-Permott Fitzgibbon, Esq., only son of the late Peter Fitzgibbon, Esq., Crown Solicitor, Rosecond Computer Solicitor, Rosecond Co

HARTLEY- On Feb. 19, at Settle, Yorkshire, G. Hartley, Esq., Solicitor,

aged 50, HODSON—On Feb. 22, at Lichfield, T. Hodson, Esq., Solicitor, aged 68, LOVELL—On Feb. 24, at Hagbourne, Berkshire, C. W. Lovell, Esq., Solicitor, Gray's-inn, aged 78.

MAXON—On Feb. 28, at Old Ford, Middlesex, Mr. Frederick Thomas Maxon, formerly of Little Friday-street, Cheapside, Solicitor, aged 75.

ORME—On Feb. 26, at Instow, Devon, C. Orme, Esq., late Registrar Evistor County Court, aged 54.

NAME ON TWO AS ALL INSTANCE DEVOID C. Orme, Esq., late Registrar Bristol County Court, aged 54.
YATES—On March 1, at Tunbridge Wells, Mary, the wife of William Yates, Esq., of Lincoln's-inn.

UNCLAIMED STOCK IN THE BANK OF ENGLAND.

The amount of Stock heretofore standing in the following Names will be transferred to the Parties claiming the same, unless other Claimants appear within Three Months:—

DELLA TORRE, JOSEPH, Lamb's Conduit-street, Merchant, Angelo Nosetti, Cuggino, near Milan, Esq., and Charless Francis Nosotti, Oxford-street, Gilder, £45 8s. 9d., Consolidated £3 per Cent. Annuities.—Claimed by said Joseph Della Torre, and C. F. Nosotti. Lyon, George William, Exeter, Esq., deceased. £1,000 Consolidated £3 per Cent. Annuities.—Claimed by Mark Kennaway, the surviving exe-

CULEN, EDWARD, Sutton Courtney, Berks, Esq. £1,000 Consolidated £3 per Cent. Annuities—Claimed by T. Hedges Graham and E. Pallen. VYNER, HRWI, Kipon, Esq., deceased. 12 dividends on £500 Consolidated Long Annuities—Claimed by Right Hon. Earl de Grey and Kipon, one of the executors.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Mainding-up of Joint Stock Compantes.

Tuesnay, Feb. 21, 1865. LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

General Rolling Stock Company (Limited).—Order by the Master of the Rolls to wind up, Feb 11. Kimber & Ellis, Lancaster-pl, Strand, and Davidson & Co, Weavers' hall, solicitors for the petitioners.
Llantwit Vardre Colliery Company (Limited).—Order by the Master of the Rolls to wind up, Feb 11. H. Dell, Bond-et, Walbrook, official liquidator. Treherne & Wolferstan, Aldermanbury, solicitors for the petitioners.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY. Isle of Wight Ferry Company.—Petition for winding up, presented Feb 17. to be heard before Vioe-Chancellor Wood on March 4. Reep, Gresham-house, Old Broad-st, solicitor for the petitioners.

FRIDAY, Feb. 24, 1865.

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY. The Life Assurance Treasury.—Notice is hereby given that Vice-Chancellor Wood will, on March 8 at 12, proceed to make a call on the several persons who are settled on the list of contributories of the said company, for £10 per share.

TUESDAY, Feb. 28, 1865.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY. Alexandra Park Company (Limited),—Order to wind up, dated Feb 18, made by the Master of the Rolls. Bailey & Co, Berners-st, so-

licitors for the petitioners. (Limited).—Vice-Chancellor Wood has fixed March 15 at 1, at his chambers New-sq, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator of the above-named

company.

Kentish Royal Hotel Company (Limited).—By an order made by the Master of the Rolls, dated Feb 18, it was ordered that the voluntary winding-up of the above company be continued. Poole & Johnson, New-sq, solicitors for the petitioner.

Maresfield Gunpowder Company (Limited).—By an order made by the Master of the Rolls, dated Feb 18, the above company was ordered to be wound up. Reed & Fhelps, Gresham-st, solicitors for

ordered so to state up.

Strand Music Hall Company (Limited).—The creditors of the abovenamed company are required, on or before March 16, to send their
names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts, to William
Turquand, Tokehhouse-yd, official liquidator. Wednesday, March

23 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts

and claims.
Universal Mercantile Association (Limited).—Petition for windingup, presented Feb 22, to be heard before Vice-Chancellor Kindersley, March 10. Treherne & Wolferstan, Aldermanbury, solicitors, for the petitioner.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

TUESDAY, Feb. 21, 1865.

Cook, Wm, Bristol, Rope and Sail Maker. March 16. Cook v Cook V.C. Stuart.

Dixon, Edw, sen, Dudley, Worcester, Esq. March 29. Smith v Berkeley, V.C. Stuart.

Dixon, Edw., Sen., Jouley, Worcester, Banker. March 29. Smith v. Berkeley, V.O. Stuart.

Foster, Pereival, Stafford, Esq. March 18. Foster v. Cookes, M.R. Heales, Geo. Saml, Great Carter-lane, Proctor. March 27. Gant v. Heales, V.C. Kindersley, Jaman, John Boykett, York-bldgs, Adelphi, Esq. March 16. Cooper, Jaman, John Boykett, York-bldgs, Adelphi, Esq. March 16.

Jarman, John Boykett, York-bldgs, Adelphi, Esq. March 16. Cooper, v Jarman, M.R.
Jones, Edw, Carregyrhew, Margam, Glamorgan. March 22. Jenkins v Jones, V.O. Stuart.
Nunn, Jas Hardy, Toppesfield, Essex. March 21. Harris v Nunn, M.R.
Price, Mary, Old Steyne, Brighton, Spinster. March 27. Sotheran v Sinear, V.C. Stuart.
Tims, Thos, Charlotte-st, Fitzroy-sq, Auctioneer. March 29. Tims v Dalgliesh, V.C. Stuart.

FRIDAY, Feb. 24, 1865.

Greaves, Mary, Radford Semele, Warwick, Widow. March 20. Flower v Greaves, M.R.
Long, Saml. Yarbridge, Isle of Wight, Solicitor. March 24. Richards v Long, M.R.
Oakley, Alfred, Southampton, Florist. April 10. Dore v Oakley, V.C.

Stuart,
Sansom, Chas, Britannia-st, Gray's-inn-road, Dealer. March 22. Sansom v Hammond, M.R.
Slater, John, Little Bolton, Lancaster, Esq. March 15. Slater v Slater, V.C. Wood.
Vause, John, jun, Crowle, Lincoln, Innkeeper. March 20. Overton v Vause, M.R.

Wheelhouse, Geo, Deptford-bridge, Kent, Esq. April 10. Buckle v Bristow, V.C. Wood.

White, Geo, Portsea, Southampton, Grocer. March 22. White v White, M.R. TUESDAY, Feb. 28, 1865.

Baker, Wm. High Ongar, Farmer, March 28. Makings v Baker, M R. Belchier, John, Broad-st. Bloomsbury, Builder, March 31. Belchier v Belchier, V. C. Kindersiev, Griffith, Jane. Bodwrdda, Aberdaron, Carnarvon, Widow. March 23. Jones v Griffith, V. C. Stuart.

Hatch, John, East Peckham, Kent, Farmer. March 28. Allen v Cooper, M. R.

Hatter, John, East Feckham, Kente, Hatter, Janch 25. Shelt v Cooper, M. R.
Hastie, Ann, Edinburgh. March 20. Mackinstosh v Steuart, M. R.
Jarvis James Sanford, Montrose House, Hackney, Esq. March 28.
Jarvis e Hooper, M. R.
Kiddle, Wm. Cottage, Gipsy-hill-road, Lower Norwood. March 28.
Garland v Kiddle, M. R.
Nash, Jno, Market Rasen, Lincoln. March 27. Nash v Brewster, M. R.
Riminton, Geo, Star and Crown, Broadway, Westminster, Publican.
April 10. Booth v Riminton, V. C. Stuart.

Creditors under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35. Last Day of Claim. TUESDAY, Feb. 21, 1865.

Brooks, Thos Dove, Southsea, Hants, Gent. March 31. Berkeley,

Brooks, Thes Dove, Southsea, Hants, Gent. March 31. Berkeley, Gray's-inn-sq.
Carr, Wm, Market Harborough, Leicester, Hotel Keeper. March 25. Douglas, Market Harborough.
Cloughly, Jas, Gt Ormond-st, Eloomsbury, Tailor. March 31. Smith & Shepherd, Golden-sq.
Curtis, Robt, Romford, Essex, Builder. April 3. Collier, Romford, Davies, David, Llandyssil, Clerk. March 25. Lloyd Lampeter.
Druce, Thos Chas, Baker-st, Portman-sq. Upholsterer. May 21.
Walker & Twyford, Southampton-st, Bloomsbury.
Goodman, Sarah, Brewer's-gn, Westminster, Cowkeeper. March 31. Field, Ely-pl, Holborn.
Harvey, Edwa Robinson, San Remo, Italy, Doctor: March 28. Barrett, Bell-vd, Doctor's-commons.

Harvey, Edwa Roomson, San Remo, Raiy, Doctor: March 28. Barrett, Bell.-yd, Doctor's commons.

Helm, Sophia Frances, Worcester. April 10. Meredith & Lucas, New-sq. Lincoln's-inn.

Hewitt, Frances, Worcester, Widow. April 10. Meredith & Lucas, New-sq. Lincoln's-inn.

Hitton, Joseph, Mitcham, Surrey, Gent. March 19. Newman, Suffolk-lane, Cannon-st.

folk-iane, Cannon-st. Hughes, Hy Joseph, Madeira, Captain 62nd Regt. March 31. Hughes, Lincoln's-inn-fields. La Terriere, Fierre Philippe de Sales, Hampton Court, Esq. May 27. Young & Jacksons, Essex-st, Srand.

La Terriere, Mary Ann Adams, Hampton Court. May 27. Young & Jacksons, Essex-st, Strand.
Mulready, Paul Augustus, Radcliffe-rd, Fulham-rd, Artist. April 1.
Purkiss, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

ampson, Alfred King, Southover, Lewes, Sussex. March 25. Clutton & Ade, Serjeant's-inn.
harrod, Thos, Hampden-st. Harrow-rd, Gent. March 31. Hume &

& Ade, Serjesus 2000.

Sharrod, Thos, Hampden-st. Harrow-rd, Gent. Manch.

Bird, Gt James-st, Bedford-row.

Utting, Saml, jun, Fakenham, Norfolk, Boot and Shoe Maker. March.

25. Bircham, Fakenham.

Titterton, John, Balsall-heath, King's Norton, Worcester. March 25.

Beale, Birm.

FRIDAY, Feb. 24, 1865.

Bastard, Thos Chas, Charlton Musgrave, Somerset, Esq. March 25. Cooper, Wincanton,

Benham, John Lee, Wigmore-st, St. Marylebone, Ironmonger. March 31. Benham, Wigmore-st. Clarkson, Fredk, Doctors' commons, Esq. Proctor. March 25. Lawrie

& Keen. Doctors'-commons Cook, Thos, St George's-pl, Walcot, Bath, Brewer. March 25. Stothert,

Gibbs, Richard, Rood-lane, London, Tea Broker. April 15. Roberts

& Sinpson, Moorgate-to. March 1. Poole & Sinpson, Moorgate-to. Harris John, Long Itchington, Warwick, Farmer. March 1. Poole & Johnson, Rugby.

Harris, Sami, Reading, Berks, Surgeon. April 22. Whatley & Dryland, Berks.

Hartley, John Thos, Everton, Lpool, Ironmonger. March 31. Collin,

Lpool.
Marshall, Robt, Wykeham North Riding, York, Buther. April I.
Grayston, jun, York.
Mayhew, John Jeremiah. Colne, Engaine, Essex, Esq.
Barnes & Neck, Colchester.
Round, Simeon, Bloomfield, Tipton, Stafford, Maltster. April 25.
Round, Tipton.
Saville, Mary Ann, Clarence-street, York, Widow. March 1. Thompson, York.
Smith, Wm. Old Kent-road, Surrey, Esq. March 30. Hancock, Sharp, & Hales, Birchin-lane.
Stark, Samil, Stapleton-hall Tavern, Licensed Victualler. April 15.
Lucas & Showler, Charing-cross.
Trickett Jas, Ecclesfield, York, Farmer. March 31. Webster,

Walters, Wm, Portsmouth, Gent. April 20. Lepard & Gammon

Cloak-lane.

Welch, Eliz, Froyfield, Wilts, Widow. April 1. Rowland.

Williamson, Geo Jas, Ffynonnau, Brecon, Esq, Barrister-at-Law.

April 14. Williamson.

TUESDAY, Feb 28, 1865.

Abel, Anthony, Oldham, Lancashire, Comedian. March, 24. Albon, Harriet, Barley, Hertford, Widow. April 3. Thurgood, Saf-fron Walden.

Bunnett, Joseph, Deptford, Kent, Engineer, April 3. Taylor & Co,

Bedford-row.
Eachus, Sami, Northwich. March 25. Cheshire, Northwich.
Edwards, John Eggar, St Mary Axe, Wholesale Tea and Coffee Dealers.
March 31. Hall, Richd Saml Howton, London-st. June 1. Bell & Co, Lincoln's-

Hall, Richd Saml Howton, London-st. June 1. 1881 & Co, Lancours-inn-fields.
Handy, Martha, West-st, Walworth, Surrey, Spinster. May 31. Bischoff & Co, Coleman-st.
Hayard, David, Breacon, Auctioneer. April 29.
Jorden, Wm Prue, Lower Belgrave-st, Eaton-sq, Surgeon. March 31.
Trherne & Wolferstan, Aldermanbury.
Lawrence, Hannah, Whitbourne, Hereford, Widow. April 29. Corles,

Worcester.
ichols, Sarah, Little Chesterford, Essex, Widow. April 3. Thurgood
Saffron Walden.

Saffron Walden.

Fither, Jas, Acton, Dairyman. March 31. Treherne & Wolferstan, Aldermanbury.

Pobjoy, Wm, Bristol, Haulier. April 6. Gillard, Bristol.

Smith, Hannah, Windsor, Berks, Widow. March 31. Sawbridge,

Cheapside.
Stamper, Joseph, Colebrook-row, Islington, Gent. March 31. Saw-bridge, Cheapside.

bridge, Cheapside.

Thurgood, Kobb Driver, Saffron Walden, Essex, Gent. April 3. Thurgood, Saffron Walden.

Warton, Chas, Springfield-terrace, Hackney-road, Commercial Clerk.

March 31. Sawbridge, Cheapside.

Assignments for Benefit of Greditors.

TUESDAY, Feb. 21, 1865. Tipper, Chas. & Edwin Fenton, Aldermanbury, Warehousemen. Feb 9. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury.

Tuesday, Feb. 28, 1865.

Dumas, Anthony Apostle, Finsbury-circus, Merchant. Jan 31. Law-rance & Co, Old Jewry-chambers.

Beeds registered pursuant to Bankrupten Act, 1861.

TUESDAY, Feb. 21, 1865.

Alderson, Hy, Carlton-rd, Kentish-town, Comm Agent. Feb 15. Comp. Reg Feb 20.
Ball, Geo, Bedford-st, Poplar, Builder. Jan 31. Comp. Reg Feb 18.
Banty, John, Leeds, York, Cloth Manufacturer. Jan 21. Conv. Reg

Feb 17.

Feb 17.

Barrs, John, Westbromwich, Stafford, Chemist. Feb 14. Conv. Reg Feb 20.

Bible, Richd, Jas Lees Swindelle, & Thos Swindells, Nottingham. Jan 28. Comp. Reg Feb 20.

Brown, John, Thorney, Cambridge, Butcher. Jan 23. Conv. Reg Feb 20.

Feb 20. West Newsigh, Leanney Westwaller, Lan 31. Conv. Reg.

Campling, Wm, Norwich, Licensed Victualler. Jan 31. Conv. Reg

Feb 17 Clark, John, Southampton. Jan 25. Comp. Reg Feb 18. Clifton, Chas, Harewood-sq, Middx, Gent. Feb 10. Comp. Reg Feb 20.

n. Edwd Gerard, Harewood-sq, Middx, Gent. Feb 10. Comp. Clifto Reg Feb 20. Crawford, Robt, New Milford, Pembroke, Licensed Victualler. Feb 8. Comp. Reg Feb 18. Cunningham, Geo Thos, Portsea, Hants, Grocer. Feb 6. Conv.

Reg Feb 20. eane, Peter Venables, Manch, Yarn Agent. Jan 24. Comp. Reg Deane, Po

Fely, Chas Fras, Adderbury, Oxford, Slater. Jan 26. Conv. Reg Feb 21. Eyles, Edwd, Chas Evans, & John Checketts Hands, Cannon-st West,

Warehousemen. Jan 26. Comp. Reg Feb 21. Furlong, Wm, Pembroke, Watchmaker. Jan 23. Conv. Reg Feb 17.

Gasson, Wm Benj, Tunbridge, Kent, Stationer. Feb 10. Comp. Reg Feb 18. Gurney, Arthur Lamb, York-rd, Battersea, Grocer. Jan 21. Asst. Reg Feb 17. Harden, Wm Hy. Beaumont-st, Mile End-rd, out of business. Feb 10. Comp. Reg Feb 20, Harrison, John, Thorne, York, Corn Miller. Jan 23. Conv. Reg Feb 17. Feb 17.

Hemingray, Silvanus, Nottingham, Silk Agent. Feb 10. Comp.
Reg Feb 20.

Hirst, Geo Edwd, Arlington-sq, Islington, Com Merchant. Jan 24.
Conv. Reg Feb 18.

Hunt, Thos Edwd, Heaton Norris, Manch, Comm Agent.
Conv. Reg Feb 17.

James, Wm Edmund. Leicester, Fancy Box Manufacturer. Jan 25.
Comp. Regr Feb 18.

Comp. Reg Feb 18.

Comp. Reg Feb 18. Comp. Reg Feb 18. Kirk, John, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Feb 13. Comp. Reg

Lowe, Joseph, Irlam, Lancaster, Gent. Feb 14. Comp. Reg Feb 20. Machin, Geo, Rotherham, York, Tobacconist. Feb 13. Ass. Reg. Feb 20. Manners, Edwd, Bedale, York, Farmer. Feb 1. Comp. Reg Feb 18. Marriott, Arthur, Watling-street, Laceman. Jan 28. Conv. Reg Feb 18.

Feu 18.
Mayes, Wm Ayres, Birm, Tailor. Jan 25. Reg Feb 21.
Mitchell, Thos, Halifax, York, Cardmaker, Jan 25. Comp. Reg Feb 21.
Morris, Alfred Valentine, Streatham, Banker's Clerk, Feb 13. Comp. Reg Feb 21. er, Anthony, Wickham Skeith, Suffolk, Miller. Jan 28. Conv.

Reg Feb 20. Parke. Conv. Parker, John, Burnley, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer. Feb 10. Conv. Reg Feb 20. Pass, John Wm, Huddersfield, York, Hatter. Jan 25. Conv. Reg

Pass, John vin, induces and visit of the latter of the lat Richd Watkins, Welbeck-st, Oil and Italian Warehouseman. Price,

Fries, fichit Westerlis, Weigeres, on and Manager and Cattle Feb 13. Asst. Reg Feb 17.

Prismall, Ezra, Thatcham, Berks, Hay and Cattle Dealer. Jan 26.

Comp. Reg Feb 20.

Randall, Edwin, Maidstone, Kent, Draper. Feb 3. Asst. Reg

Feb 20.

Richards, Wm Hy, Marazion, Cornwall, Mining Agent. Jan 23. Comp. Reg Feb 18.

Richards, vin 13, standards, vin 14, standards, vin 14, standards, vin 14, standards, vin 16, standards, vin

13. Conv. Reg Feb 18.

Scott, Wm, Braintree, Essex, Clothier. Feb 6. Comp. Reg Feb 17.

Spettz, Louis, Lpool, Merchant. Feb 6. Inspectorship. Reg Feb 21.

Statham, Francis Kington, Shrubland-grove, Dalston, Clerk in Holy Orders. Feb 16. Comp. Reg Feb 17.

Sulivan, Robt Desmond, Northampton, Farmer. Feb 4. Inspectorship. Reg Feb 18.

ship. Reg Feb 18.

acksoln, Hermann. Chorlton-upon-Medlock, Lancaster, Dyer. Jan 23. Comp. Reg Feb 18.

annson, Saml Wm, Barnal-grove, Bethnal-green, Baker. Feb 4. Tack

Comp. Reg Feb 18.
 Thompson, Saml Wm, Barnal-grove, Bethnal-green, Baker. Feb 4.
 Comp. Reg Feb 17.
 Thornton, Valentine. Emanuel Thornton, Joseph Thornton. Jas Thornton, & John Thornton, Church and Enfeld, Lancaster, Cotton

Thornton, & John Thornton, Charles & Manufacturers. Jan 28. Conv. Reg Feb 21. Ware, John, Lyng, Somerset, Carpenter. Feb 11. Comp. Reg

Waters, Saml, & John Saintey, Tabernacle-sq, Middx, Builders. Feb 10. Comp. Reg Feb 17. Wolfsky, Moritz, Newgate-st, Bag Manufacturer. Jan 13. Comp. Reg Feb 17.

eatman, Thos, Lpool, Paint Manufacturer. Jan 25. Comp. Reg Feb 18. Yeat FRIDAY, Feb. 24, 1865.

Ansten, Wm, Rochester, Kent, Plumber. Jan 31. Asst. Reg Feb Arkroyd, Jonathan, and Thos Wroe, Bradford, Rag Dealers. Feb 20.

Comp. Reg Feb 23.

Baker, Wm, Geo, Padley, Barton-on Humber, Lincoln, Draper. Jan 31. Comp. Reg Feb 23.

Barry, John, Bathampton, Somerset, Accountant. Jan 28. Asst.

Reg Feb 22.

Bourne, John, Hereford, Corn Factor, Feb 1. Conv. Reg Feb 21.

Brooks, Edw, and Sami Lomax Tottington, Lower End, Manufacturers, Jan 27. Comp. Reg Feb 21.

Brooks, Bruce, John, Paradise-road, Stockwell, out of business. Feb 21.

Arr. Reg Feb 24.

Carr, Hy Lascelles, & Thomas Hay Carr, Cloth Merchants. Feb 4.

Comp. Reg Feb 22.

Carson, Wm, sen, Sheffleld, York, Joiner. Feb 18. Comp. Reg Feb 24. Reg Feb 22.

Cohen, Abraham, Birm, Jeweller. Feb 10. Conv. Reg Feb 21. Crane, Hy, Kidderminster, Worcester, Auctioneer. Jan 27. Conv. Reg Feb 22. w, Edw, Ramsey, Huntingdon, Draper. Feb 8. Comp. Reg Feb 22 Der

ett, Hy, Wootton, Isle of Wight, Miller. Jan 30, Conv. Reg Feb 22 Eaves, Hy, Handsworth, Stafford, Tailor. Jan 30. Comp. Reg Feb 22

Reg Feb 20. Comp. Reg Feb 20. Flooks, Wm, Wells, Somerset, Chemist. Jan 5. Comp. Reg Feb 22. Frazer, John, Southampton, Draper. Feb 2. Conv. Reg Feb 22. Gair, Wm, Wallsend, Northumberland, Rope Manufacturer. Feb 10. Frazer. John, Southampton, Draper. Co. Gair, Wm, Wallsend, Northumberland, Rope Manufacturer. Feb 10. Comp. Reg Feb 22.
Haller, Elijah, Kingston-upon-Hull, Leather Seller. Feb 16. Letter of License. Reg Feb 22.

Hilditch, Wm. Congleton, Chester, Ironmonger, Jan 26, Conv. Reg. Huggins, John, Launceston, Cornwall, Grocer. Jan 21. Asst. Reg Jukes, Wm, West Bromwich, Stafford, Grocer. Jan 30. Asst. Reg Feb 23. Keené, Francis Edwin, Seymour-pl, Brompton, Gent. Feb 1. Comp. Reg Feb 22. n, Thos, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Jeweller. Jan 31. Comp. Rog Kinls Feb 2

Kirby, Hy, Chedworth, Gloucester, Farmer. Feb 7. Comp. Reg Feb 23 Lucas, Martha Camilla, Langarren, Hereford, Widow. Feb 16. Asst.

Reg Feb 29.

Reg Feb 72. Lynn, John, Brighton, Grocer. Feb 17. Comp. Reg Feb 22. Lynn, John, Brighton, Grocer. Feb 17. Comp. Reg Feb 22. McConnell, Wm, Manch, Wine and Spirit Merchant. Feb 13. Comp. Reg Feb 21. [artin, Claude Auguste, Acton, out of business, Feb 14. Comp.

Martin, Claud Reg Feb 23. ice. Saml Solomon, Watling-st, Merchant. Feb 9. Asst. Reg Manr Feb 23

Hy, Uttoxeter, Stafford, Shoe Manufacturer. Feb 7. Conv. Miller. Reg Feb 20.
Pridham, Thos Brawn, Manch, Tea and Coffee Merchant. Jan 30.
Comp. Reg Feb 22.
Palmer, Hy, Abingdon, Berks, Coal Merchant. Jan 31. Comp. Reg

Feb 23. Priestman, Saml, Grantham, Lincoln, Butcher. Jan 28. Asst. Reg

Rumens, Wm, Lewisham, Kent, Grocer. Feb 1. Comp. Reg Feb 23 Sandford, John, Mounton, Monmouth, Paper Maker. Jan 28. Conv.

seg ren 23.
Smith. Hy, Bristol, Boot Maker. Feb 13. Conv. Reg Feb 22.
Stringer, Richd Durant, Staines, Middlesex, Grocer. Jan 30. Asst. Reg Feb 22.

Waite, Jas, Northampton, Butcher. Feb 2. Conv. Reg Feb 22.

TUESDAY, Feb. 28, 1865.

Ainsworth, Hy, & John Fish, Over Darwen, Lancaster, Cloth Manufacturers. Jan 31. Conv. Reg Feb 27. Bailey, Wm, Halifax, York, Manufacturer. Feb 2. Conv. Reg Feb 27. Bennitt, Wm, Kinver, Stafford, Iron Master. Jan 30. Comp. Reg

Feb 25.
Bentley, John, Oldham, Lancaster, Tailor. Feb 8. Comp. Reg Feb 27.
Bowen, John Jas, Euston-rd, Fewterer. Feb 14. Comp. Reg Feb 24.
Carr, Geo, Cheapside, Musical Instrument Dealer. Feb 6. Comp.
Reg Feb 24.
Chappell, Saml, Kent Green, Chester, Flint Grinder. Jan 31. Conv.

Reg Feb 27. Adolph, Sunderland, Durham, Tailor. Jan 28. Comp. Reg Coher

Consan, Leopold, Philpott-lane, Merchant. Feb 20. Comp. Reg. Feb 27

Cragg, Thos, Wakefield, York, Merchant. Feb 21. Comp. Reg Feb 24. Craig, Robt, Birkenhead, Chester, Engineer. Feb 18. Comp. Reg Feb 25. Creed, Wm, Birm, Cabinet Maker. Feb 1. Comp. Reg Feb 25.
Dando, Nathaniel, Bread-st, Cheapside, Warehouseman. Feb 4

Creed, Wm, Birm, Cathine alasen, Feb 4, Dando, Nathaniel, Bread-st, Cheapside, Warehouseman. Feb 4, Conv. Reg Feb 24.
Druce, Geo Fredk, Leigham Court-rd, Streatham, Gent. Jan 31.
Conv. Reg Feb 28.
Dumas, Anthony Apostle, Finsbury-circus. Jan 31. Conv. Reg

Feb 28.
Graham, David, Newcastle upon-Tyne, Leather Seller. Jan 27.
Comp. Reg Feb 24.
Greenfield, David, Birm, Brass Founder. Feb 6. Comp. Reg Feb 27.
Greenfield, Francis Saml, Nottingham, Baker. Feb 22. Comp. Reg

Feb 24. Wm, Stratford, Saw Mill Proprietor. Jan 31. Comp. Reg Grout.

Feb 28 Grundler, Edmund, & Richd Ormond, Fenchurch-st, Comm Merchants.

Grunder, Edmund, & Richard Chromat, Fendanteness, Comin Merchantes, Feb 2. Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Hannay, Jas, Manch, Travelling Draper. Feb 11. Conv. Reg Feb 25.

Jenkins, Fredk, jun. Chester, Boot Maker. Feb 3. Conv. Reg Feb 25.

Jenkins, Fredk, jun. Chester, Boot Maker. Feb 23. Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Jump, Jas, Lpool, Contractor. Feb 22. Inspectorship. Reg Feb 28.

Keogh, John, Stafford, Baker. Jan 30. Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Lacy, Wm Skinner, East-pl, Lambeth, Upholsterer. Feb 9. Comp. Keogh, John, S Lacy, Wm Ski Reg Feb 27.

Leney, Geo, sen, Gloucester-ter, Westbourne-grove North, Comm Agent. Jan 28. Conv. Reg Feb 24. Long, Chas, Alexander-ter, Stockwell, Milliner, Feb 20. Comp. Reg Feb 28.

FeD 28. Love, John, High-st, Feltham, Draper. Jan 31. Conv. Reg Feb 27. Lunham, Jas, High-st, Southwark, Wholesale Cheesemonger. Feb 1. Comp. Reg Feb 28. McGuffie, Anthony, Feltham, Middx, Draper. Jan 31. Conv. Reg

Feb 27

Feb 27.

McGuffie, David Coulton, Florence-villas, Feltham, Draper. Jan 30.

Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Naylor, Joseph, & Isaac Naylor, Bradford, York, Brick Makers. Jan
30. Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Newbott, Chas, & Chas Jas Newbott, Redbridge, Southampton, Engineers. Jan 30. Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Parker, Fredk Wm, Sheffield, Machinist. Feb 20. Comp. Reg Feb 27.

Pearce, Eliza, Chew Magna, Somerset, Grocer. Feb 2. Conv. Reg

Feb 27. andall, John, Feltham, Sussex, Lodging-house Keeper. Feb 16. Asst. Reg Feb 24. Rhodes, Stephen, Farnworth, Lancaster, Joiner. Feb 2. Conv. Reg

Feb 23. Richardson, John, & Saml Richardson, Heywood, Lancaster, Cotton-Spinners. Jan 31. Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Rickett, Thos, Buckingham, Engineer. Jan 30. Asst. Reg Feb 27. Robinson, Dobson, Huddersfield, York, Wheelwright. Feb 1. Conv. Reg Feb 23. Robinson, Sarah, Lpool, Boot Manufacturer. Jan 23. Comp. Reg

n, Sarah, Lpool, Boot Manufacturer. Jan 23. Comp. Reg Robson, Saml, South Shields, Durham, Grocer, Jan 31, Comp. Reg.

ogers, Nathaniel, Birkenhead, Chester, Provision Dealer. Feb 1.

Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Rowden, Wm, Vernon-ter, Kensington-park, House Decorator. Feb 1.

Conv. Reg Feb 24.

Rowley, Arthur, Kingswinford, Stafford, Builder. Feb 1. Conv. Reg Feb 25.

Shaw, David, Morley, nr Leeds, York, Grocer. Jan 31. Conv. Reg Feb 27

rester, Lucas, Westbromwich, Stafford, Iron Master. Feb 9. Conv. Reg Feb 24.

Reg Feb 24.

Splatt, Sagar Holden, & Jas Somerville. Postern-row, Tower-hill,
Ship Chandlers. Jan 28. Asst. Reg Feb 25.

Talbot, John Stewart Shreeve, Westow-hill, Norwich, Job Master.
Jan 31. Comp. Reg Feb 28.

Thompson, Geo Vernon, Leeds, York, Tailor. Feb 20. Comp. Reg
Feb 27.

Feb 27.
Tichborne, Sir Alfred Joseph Doughty, Bart, Tichborde-park, nr
Alresford, Southampton. Feb 13. Conv. Reg Feb 27.
Turner, Jas, Nottingham, Miller. Feb 23. Conv. Reg Feb 28.
Unthank, David, Milton, Wilts, Yeoman. Jan 31. Conv. Reg Feb 27.

Unthank, David, Milton, Wilts, Yeoman, Jan 31. Conv. Reg Feb 27.
Millett, Thos, St Martin's-st, Leicester-sq, Italian Warchouseman.
Feb 1. Comp. Reg Feb 27.
Wallis, Edward, & Richd Tadman, Kingston-upon-Hull, Stone Masons.
Jan 30. Conv. Reg Feb 25.
Wheeler, Moses, Edward Martin Wheeler, & Joseph Wheeler, Robert-st,
Grosvenor-sq, Coach Smiths, Feb 9. Comp. Reg Feb 27.
Whitaker, Jans, Bacup, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer. Jan 30.
Comp. Reg Feb 27.
Walker, Wm Geo, Chatharn, Kent, Chemist. Jan 31. Comp. Reg
Feb 27.
Wilkes Wm, Wellington Salon, Cabinat Walker, Ech 27. Comp. Reg

Wilkes, Wm, Wellington, Salop, Cabinet Maker. Feb 3. Comp. Reg Feb 27.

Woollatt, Thos Jas, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. Jan 31. Conv. Reg Feb 27. Wilson, Wm.

ilson, Wm, & Thos Wilson, Habergham Eaves, nr Burnley, Lan-caster, Manufacturers. Feb 11. Conv. Reg Feb 25.

Bankrupts.

TUESDAY, Feb. 21, 1865. To Surrender in London.

Atloff, Auguste Geo, Upper Berkeley-st. Portman-sq, Bootmaker. Pet Feb 17. March 6 at 1. Crowdy, Serjeant's-inn. Bardwell, Geo Syder, Prisoner for Debt, Norwich. Adj Feb 14.

March 6 at 12.

March of at 12.

Barratt, Wm. jun, Dover-st, Piccadilly, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 20. March 7 at 2. Chidley, Old Jowry.

Bray, Chas, New-road, Hammersmith, Builder. Pet Feb 15. March 7 at 11. Johnson, Clifford's inn.

Bunyard, Chas, Bucklersbury, Merchant. Pet Feb 18. March 6 at 1.

Camp, Bucklersbury,

Castle, Thos Hy, Reading, Berks, Linen Draper. Pet Feb 17. March 15 at 11. Courtenay & Co., Gracechurch-st.

Clark, Saml Edwd, Jewin-st, Cripple-gate, Die Sinker. Pet Feb 14.

March 6 at 1. Hume, South Molton-st, Oxford-st.

Earle, Chas, High-st, Kensington, Saddle and Harness Maker. Pet Feb 18. March 15 at 12. Anderson & Stanford, Gt James-st.

Frampton, Jas. Newtown, Christchurch, Hants, Builder. Pet Feb 18.

Feb 18. March 15 at 12. Auderson & Stanford, Gt James-st.
Frampton, Jas, Newtown, Christchurch, Hants, Builder. Pet Feb 18.
March 15 at 1. Druitt, Christchurch.
Goody, Geo Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 11. March 7 at 12.
Stinton, Cavendish-sq.
Grimes, Jas, West Cowes, Isle of Wight, Hants, Builder. Pet Feb 18.
March 6 at 1. White, Dane's-inn, Strand.
Hall, John, Woolston, Southampton, Marine Butcher. Pet Feb 17.
March 7 at 12. Paterson & Son, Bouverie-st, for Mackay, Southampton.

Halliwell, Queen-st-pl, Cannon-st, Engineer. Pet Feb 15. March 6 at 2. Parson, Duke-st, Adelphi.
owden, Thos Anderton, Phipp-st, Curtain-rd, Gasfitter. Pet Feb 18.
March 7 at 1. Hutson, Clifton-st, Finsbury.

March 7 at 1. Hutson, Clifton-st, Finsbury. Howlett, Frederic, Lewes, Hair Net Manufacturer. Adj Feb 15. March 6 at 12. Aldridge. Jones, Thos, sen, Surbiton, Kingston-upon-Thames, Ironmonger.

Pet Feb 18. March 6 at 2. Fisher, King's Bench-walk, Templ Koch, Peter, Upper Fitzroy-pl, Kentish-town-rd, Baker. Pet 15. March 7 at 12. Olive. Portsmouth-street, Lincoln's-inn.

March 7 at 12. Olive, Portsmouth-street, Lincoln's-inn.
 Leisk, John, and Elizabeth Sutherland, Gracechurch-st, Merchants.
 Pet Jan 31. March 8 at 1. Reed & Phelps, Gresham-st.
 Maddox, Richel Hy, Luard-st, Islington, Commercial Traveller.
 Pet Feb 17. March 6 at 1. Drew, New Basinghall-st.
 Marks, Chas, Irommonger-lane, Merchant.
 Pet Jan 27. March 6 at 1. Reed & Phelps, Gresham-st.
 Mobbs, Josbua, Barnett-grove, Hackney-rd, Gent.
 Pet Feb 16. March 7 at 12. Heydon, Serle-st, Lincoln's-inn.
 Morris Michael Love-lane Cheanzielle Morebant.

Tat 12. Heydon, Serlest, Lincoln's-inn.

Morris, Michael, Love-lane, Cheapside, Merchant. Pet Feb 15. March
6 at 2. Abrahams, Gresham-st.

Nugent, Augustus Nagle Christopher Robt. Prisoner for Debt, Winchester. Fet Feb 15. March 6 at 2. Ford, Portsea.

Phillips, Catherine Ann, Dale-rd, Kentish-town, Spinster, Fet Feb
16. March 8 at 2. Greatorex, Chancery-lane.

Rowé, Jabez Coath, Basinghall-st, Optician. Pet Feb 18. March 15
at 12. Lewis, Gt Marthorough-st.

Thurston, Mary Ann, Charlotte-st, Portland-pl, Widow. Pet Feb 16.

March 6 at 12. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.

Tubb, John, New Hinksey, Berks, Licensed Victualler. Fet Feb 16.

March 7 at 11. Hill, Basinghall-st.

Warrener, Robt, Park-rd, Peckham, out of business. Fet Feb 16.

March 8 at 2. Sole & Co. Aldermanbury.

Will, Jas, Fann-st, Goswell-st, Bealer in Bread. Tet Feb 17. March
10 at 12. Buchanan, Basinghall-st.

Wright, Hy, Cambridge-rd, Mile End, Oil and Colourman. Pet Feb 16. March 6 at 12. Boydell, Queen's-sq, Bloomsbury.

To Surrender in the Country.

Archer, Abraham, jun, Ossett and Horbury, York, Cloth Manufacturer. Pet Feb 15. Leeds, March 6 at 11. Hill, Bradford. Baker, Geo, Coningsby, Labourer. Pet Feb 14. Horncastle, Feb 28. at 11. Adcock, Horncastle. Barton, Josiah, and Chas Barton, Bradford, York, Stuff Manufacturers. Pet Feb 16. Leeds, March 6 at 11. Hill, Bradford. Bertram, Jas, Sheffield, Vork, Iron, Steel, and Hardware Dealer. Adj Jan 23. Sheffield, March 8 at 1. Binney & Son, Sheffield.

Bowman, Thos, Percy Main, Northumberland, Publican. Pet I 18. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 9 at I. Harle & Co, Newcast upon-Tyne

Bradshaw, Johnson, Prisoner for Debt, Locol, Adi Feb 17. Locol.

March 4 at 12.

Calvert, Fielding, Old Accrington, Lancaster, Builders. Pet Feb 15.

Haslington, March 21 at 12. Ellis, Accrington.

Cawthray, Jabez, Yeadon, York, Greeer. Pet Feb 17. Otley, March 15 at 11. Hartley, Otley.

Cawtnray, Jabez, Yeadon, York, Grocer. Pet Feb 17. Otley, March 15 at 11. Hartley, Otley.
Cockshott, John Pollard, Skipton, York, Draper. Pet Feb 17. Leeds,
March 8 at 11. Bond & Barwick, Leeds.
Collingwood, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Jan 18. Lancaster, March 6 at 11. Morgan, Manch.
Considine, Denis, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, out of business. Pet Feb 18.
Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 9 at 1. Harle & Co, Newcastle-upon-

Tyne.

Courtnay, Robt Henelade, Brighton, Photographic Artist. Pet Feb 15.

Brighton, March 2 at 11. Lamb, Brighton.

Deaves, Benj Watter, Gleensford, Suffolk, Innkeepet. Pet Feb 13.

Sudbury, March 4 at 12. Mumford, Sudbury.

Dixon, Thos, Lincoln-hill, Salop, Moulder. Pet Feb 17. Madeley, March 11 at 12. Walker, Wellington.

Eastwood, John, Bootle, Lpool, Wheelwright. Pet Feb 16. Lpool, March 4 at 11. Harris, Lpool.

Edwards, Richd, Tiverton, Devon, Farmer. Pet Feb 17. Tiverton, March 3 at 11. Cockram, Tiverton.

Fish, Wm, Holbeck, Leeds, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 10. Leeds, March 8 at 11. Rockram, Tiverton.

at 11. Rooke, Leeds, interest 120 10. Leeds, interest at 11. Rooke, Leeds.

Garside, Geo, Walkerfield, Durham, Cattle Salesman. Adj Feb 15.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 9 at 12.30. Hoyle, Newcastle-upon-

Tyne. arside, Thos, Walkerfield, Durham, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 15. Bar-arside, Thos, Walkerfield, Durham, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 15. nard Castle, March 6 at 12. Nixon, Barnard Castle

Griffiths, Edwd. Garnvach Nantyglo, Monmouth, Nail Manufacturer. Pet Feb 16. Tredegar, March 17 at 2. Simons & Plews, Merthyr

Tydfil.
Haigh, Jas Cowling, Prisoner for Debt, York. Adj Feb 11. Bradford,
March 7 at 10.
Haley, Joseph, Trisoner for Debt, York. Adj Feb 11. Bradford,
March 7 at 10.

March 7 at 10.

Hodder, Saml, and John Hodder, Frome, Somerset, Builders. Pet Feb 17. Frome, March 6 at 11. Cruttwell & Daniel, Frome. Horbury, John. Prisoner for Debt, Chester. Adj Feb 15. Lpool, March 4 at 11. Turner, Lpool.

Jeffery, Wm, Northampton, Gardener. Pet Feb 18. Northampton, March 9 at 11. Sheild & White, Northampton.

Jennings, Sam, Bradford, York, Worsted Spinner. Pet Feb 10. Leeds, March 8 at 11. Lancaster, Bradford, and Bond & Barwick, Leeds, Kenyon, Jane, Accrington, Lancaster out of businsss. Pet Feb 14 (for pau.) Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Gardner, Manch. Kershaw, Wm, Gomersal, York, Manfacturer. Pet Feb 14. Leeds, March 6 at 11. Blackburn & Son, Leeds.

John, Barrow-in-Furness, Lancaster, Labourer. Pet Feb 13 pau). Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Gardner, Manch. ing, John (for pau).

Kinnear, Thomas Sankey, Lpool, Theatrical Director. Pet Feb 11 (for pau). Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Gardner, Manch.

Kinnear, Thomas Sankey, Lpool, Theatrical Director. Fet Feb 11 (for pan). Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Gardner, Manch. Knight. Robt, Birkenhead, Chester, Provision Dealer. Pet Feb 16. Lpool, March 4 at 11. Rymer, Lpool. Knipe, John, Thurlby, Lincoln, Machinist. Pet Feb 17. Bourn, March 2 at 10. Law, Stamford.

Law, Jas, Bolton, Lancaster, Draper. Pet Feb 17. Bolton, March 6 at 10. Richardson & Brandwood, Bolton.

Levin, Wolf, Sunderland, Durham, Clothier. Pet Feb 17. Sunderland, March 14 at 2. Brignal, Durham.

Lewis, Wm, Shiffnall, Salop, Eating-house Keeper. Pet Feb 18. Madeley, March 11 at 12. Walker, Wellington.

McCabe, Owen, Everton, Lpool, Comm Agent. Pet Feb 18. Lpool, March 6 at 12. Evans & Co. Lpool.

March 6 at 12. Evans & Co. Lpool.

McLood, John, Heskin, Lancaster, Farmer. Pet Feb 13. Chorley, March 16 at 10. Morris, Chorley.

Manners, Christopher, Pocklington, York, Saddler. Pet Feb 15. Pocklington, March 4 at 10. Harle, Leeds.

Meadows, Geo, Gt Hampton, Worcester, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 15. Evesham, March 4 at 10. Eades, Evesham.

Miller, Jas Ellershaw, Lancaster, Grocer. Pet Feb 8. Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Tilley, Lancaster.

Morecoft, Hy, Parr Flat, Lancaster, Farmer. Pet Feb 13. St Helen's, March 3 at 11. Marsh, St Helen's, March 3 at 11. Marsh, St Helen's

Moreorott, Hy, Part int, Lancaster, Farmer. Fet Feb 15. St Includes, March 3 at 11. Marsh, St Helen's, Morris, Wm, Manch, Accountant. Pet Feb 17. Manch, March 10 at 11. Woodall, Manch. Peck, Walter, St Peter's, Kent, Gent. Pet Feb 17. Margate, March 4 at 12. Towne, Margate.

Ponsty, Wm, Brighton, Artist. Pet Feb 14. Brighton, March 1 at 11.

Lamb, Prighton.
Rivenall, Edwd, Everton, Lpool, Bookseller. Pet Feb 17. Lpool,
March 4 at 12. Harris, Lpool.
Roberts, Joseph, Everton, Lpool, Comm Agent. Pet Feb 13 (for pau).
Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Gardner, Manch.

Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Gardner, Manch. Ryccroft, Geo. Everton, Lpool, Tailor. Adj Feb 23 (for pau). Lan-caster, March 10 at 12. Gardner, Manch. Seed, Thos, Preston, Lancaster, Earthenware Dealer. Fet Feb 11 (for pau). Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Rawlinson, Lancaster. Gardner, Manch. I. Tailor. Adj Feb 23 (for pau). Lan-

Sidebottom, Hy, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Feb 14. Lancas-

Sidebottom, Hy, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Feb 14. Lancaster, Merch 9 at 11. Morgan, Manch.
Smart, Uriah, Cardiff, Glamorzan, Beer Retailer. Pet Feb 16. Cardiff, March 6 at 11. Ensor, Cardiff.
Smith, John, Kempsey, Worcester, Beerhouse Keeper. Pet Feb 16.
Worcester, March 9 at 11. Wilson, Worcester.
Smith, Joseph, Birm, Metre Inspector. Pet Feb 15. Birm, March 20 at 10. East, Birm, Lancaster, March 20 at 10. East, Birm, Lancaster, Saddley, Pet Feb 17. Shoffield

at 10. East, Birm.

Warriner, John, Handley, Derby, Saddler. Pet Feb 17. Sheffield,
March 8 at 1. Binney & Son, Sheffield.

Wheeler, Edmd, Wendlebury, Oxford, Publican. Pet Feb 15. Bicester,
March 8 at 11. Berridge, Bicester,
Mitchead, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, Lpool, Adj Feb 17. Lpool, March
4 at 11. Turner, Lpool.

Jates, Robt, Accrington, Lancaster, Painter. Pet Feb 13 (for pau).

Lancaster, March 10 at 12. Gardner, Manch.

FRIDAY, Feb. 24, 1865. To Surrender in London.

Allen, Benj, Milton-next-Gravesond, Kent, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 22. March 14 at 1. Wilkinson, Nicholas-lane. Allen, Robt, Hulme, Manch, Beerseller. Pet Feb 21. Salford, March 11 at 9.30. Gardner, Manch. Barry, Jas, Weymouth-pl, New Kent-rd, out of business. Pet Feb 20. March 15 at 1. Beard, Basinghall-st. Brown, Wm Thos, Pembridge-villas, Bayswater, Tailor. Pet Feb 18 (for pau.) March 8 at 12. Brawnell, Cannon-st. Bullen, Wm, Blakenay, Norfolk, Plumber. Pet Feb 16. March 7 at 1. Doyle, Grays'-inn.

Bullen, Wm., Blakenay, Norfolk, Plumber. Pet Feb 16. March 7 at 1. Doyle, Grays'-inn.
Dayken, John Joseph, Holt, Norfolk, Builder. Pet Feb 18. March 15 at 1. Ashuret & Co, Old Jewry.
Davis, Hy. Marshfield-st, Isle of Dogs, Poplar, Plasterer. Pet Feb 22. March 20 at 12. Marshall, Hatton-garden.
Davis, Hy Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 22 (for pau).
March 13 at 12. Charlton, Blackfriars.
Davis, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 18. March 13 at 11.

Davis, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 12. (for paul. Aldridge.
Dobell, Daniel, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 22 (for paul. March, 13 at 12. Charlton, Blackfriars.
Doddemeade, Wm Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 20 (for paul. March 13 at 11. Debte, Gnildhall-chambers.
England, Wm Chas, Aylesbury, Bucks, Hay Merchant. Pet Feb 20. March 8 at 1. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.
Frinnely, Augustus Francis Richd, Lower Streatham, Surrey, Merchant's Clerk. Pet Feb 17. March 15 at 11. Linklaters & Hackwood. Walbrook.

chant's Cierk. Pet Feb 17. March 15 at 11. Linkhaters & Hack-wood, Walbrook.
ranz, Wm, Cannon-st, Merchant. Pet Feb 22. March 13 at 12.
Harrison, Basinghall-st.

Harrison, Basinghall-st,
Green, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Jan 18. March 13 at 11.
Aldridge, Moorgate-st.
Hayne, Saml Holditch Thos, Red Lion-st, Clerkenwell, Manufacturing
Silversmith. Pot Feb 20. March 8 at 11. Ashurst & Co, Old Jawry.
Hilbert, Philip, Mountfield, Sussex, Farmer. Pet Feb 18. March 7 at
2. Treherne & Wolferston, Aldermanbury.
Hill, Robt Hicks, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 17. March 14

at 1.

Holder, Chas, Liverpool-st, Carpenter. Pet Feb 21. March 15 at 2.

Pope, Old Broad-st,

Hughes, Hy Chas, Queen-st, Portsea, Hants, Auctioneer. Pet Feb
21. March 6 at 2. White, Strand.

Jones, Wm. Marlborongh-rd, Peckham, General Dealer. Pet Feb 21.

March 13 at 11. Hill, Basinghall-st.

Jones, Wm. George-st, Camberwell, Butcher.

at 11. Silvester, Newington.

Keeble, Saral, Prisoner for Debt, London.

Rechle, Saral, Prisoner for Debt, London.

Adj Feb 17. March 8 at 12. Aldridge.

Metcalfe, Thos, Prisoner for Debt, London.

Adj Feb 17. March 14.

at 1.

at 1.

at 1. Mills, Allen, Prisoner for Debt, Norwich Castle. Pet Feb 11. March 13 at 12. Morris, Old Jewry.

Moore, Wm Lovell, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 21 (for pan)

March 15 at 2. Charlton, Blackfriars.

Mott, John Wm, & Benj Nickels, Clapton, Tobacco Pouch Makers.

Pet Feb 20. March 13 at 11. Reed, Basinghall-st.

Norton, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 13. March 16

at 12. Robt, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 18. March 13 at

Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 17. March 8 at 12. Aldridge

Addrage.

Ridler, Handy, Prisoner for Debt, Lendon. Pet Feb 20 (for pau), March 15 at 2. Dobie, Basinghall-st.

Seaward, Wm. Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 17. March 8 at

Aldridge 12. Aurilage. Steel, Ann. High Holborn, Boot and Shoe Dealer. Pet Feb 15. March 8 at 1. Linklaters & Hackwood, Walbrook. Taylor, Thos, Heston, Baker. Pet Feb 22. March 20 at 11. Mitton,

Hounslow

Hounslow, Walmsley, Thos, & Hezekish Walmsley, Leek, Stafford, Silk Manufacturers. Pet Feb 6. March 8 at 12. Sole & Co, Aldermanbury. Williams, Chas Cave, Glasshouse-yd. Goswell-st, Contractor. Pet Feb 21. March 16 at 11. Lawrance & Co, Old Jewry.

To Surrender in the Country.

Allcock, Jeremiah, Prisoner for Debt, Chester. Adj Feb 15. Macclesfield, March 6 at 11. Higginbotham & Barclay.
Almond, Edwd, Gildersome, York. Cloth Manufacturer. Pet Feb 21.
Leeds, March 8 at 11. North & Sons, Leeds.
Bailey, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, Shrewsbury. Adj Feb 16. Birm,
March 8 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
Beddall, Robt, Beddord, Journeyman Blacksmith. Pet Feb 18. Bedford, March 7 at 11. Jessopp, Bedford.
Blakeley, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, Manch. Adj Feb 14. Manch, March
10 at 11.

First, We. Craws. Peners. Adj Ech 15. (fer. 1902). Craws. News. 20.

Bratt ntatt, Wm, Crewe, Draper. Adj Feb 15 (for pau). Crewe, March 30 at 10. Bent, Northwich.

Braund, Arscott. Black Torrington, Devon, Farmer. Pet Exeter, March 8 at 12. Stokes, Truro, and Hirtzell, Exeter

Braund, Arscott. Black Torrington, Devon, Farmer. Pet Feb 22. Exeter, March 8 at 12. Solokes, Truro, and Hirtzell, Exeter.

Brommage, Arthur, Walsall, Stafford, Comm Agent. Pet Feb 23. Birm, March 10 at 12. Glover, Walsall.

Birm, March 10 at 12. Glover, Walsall.

Burkey, Thos, Birchenhead, Chester, Beerhouse-keeper. Pet Feb 17. Choster, March 6 at 11.

Choster, March 6 at 11.

Chenett, Jas, Longhann, Dorset, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 22. Hawden, March 8 at 12. Harle, Leeds.

Chenett, Jas, Longhann, Dorset, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 21. Wimborne Minster. Narch 17 at 11. Tanner, Wimborne Minster. Pet Feb 22. Newport, March 8 at 11. Catheart, Newport.

Clarke, Joseph Wright, Anwick, Lincoln, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 21. Sleaford, March 9 at 10. Snow, New Sleaford.

Colesworthy, Win Hy, Chathann, Kent, General Dealer. Pet Feb 21. Rochester, March 7 at 2. Hayward, Rochester.

Cooley, Thos Black, Nottingham, Salesman. AdJ Feb 21. Nottingham, March 29 at 11.

Davies, Robt. Swanses, Glamorgan, Grocer. Pet Feb 20. Swansea, March 8 at 2. Morris, Swanses.

Denton, Edwards, David, Lincoln, Shopkeeper. Pet Feb 21. Lincoln, March 8 at 11. Brown & Son, Lincoln.

Edwards, John, Middlesbrough, York, Painter. Pet Feb 18. Stockton-on-Tees, March 8 at 3. Dobson, Middlesbrough, Sim, March 20 at 10. Ellenthorpe, Rochdale, Builder. Pet Feb 18. Manch, March 7 at 12.

at 10.
Ellenthorpe, Rochdale, Builder. Pet Feb 18. Manch, March 7 at 12.
Standrivg, Manch.
Garton, Thos, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Adj Feb 21. Nottingham, March 29 at 11.
Gordon, Chas Halford, Finningham, Suffolk, Schoolmaster. Pet Feb
14. Stowmarket, March 2 at 3. Gudgeon & Son, Stowmarket.

Halliwell, Wm, Blackburn, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer. Adj Feb

14. Stowmarket, America 2 at 3. Gaugeon & Son, Stowmarket.
Halliwell, Wm, Blackburn, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer. Adj Feb
15. Manch, March 9 at 11.
Harcom, Joshua, Swansea, Glamorgan, Builder. Fet Feb 21. Bristol,
March 8 at 11. Press & Inskip, Bristol.
Hardisty, Mark, Longwood, Huddersfield, York, Grocer. Pet Feb 20.
Leeds, March 8 at 11. Simpson, Leeds.
Hawkesworth, Thos, Swinegate, Leeds, Currier. Pet Feb 20. Leeds,
March 8 at 11. Fullan, Leeds.
Henthorn, John Hardman, Lancaster, Beer Retailer. Pet Feb 21.
Salford, March 11 at 930. Mann, Manch.
Hodson, Wm, Masbrough, York, Grocer. Pet Feb 20. Rotherham,
March 13 at 3. Hirst, Rotherham, Attorney's Clerk. Pet Feb 22.
Birm, March 13 at 22. Green, Birmingham.
Johnson, Goo, Tideswell, Derby, Farmer. Pet Feb 14. Bakewell,
March 14 at 11. Tominson, Ashbourne.
Jones, Jas, Llaneynfelin, Cardigan, Draper. Pet Feb 21. Bristol,
March 8 at 11. Brittan & Sons, Bristol.
Lagden, Robt, Bury St Edmund's, Suffolk, out of business. Pet Feb
20. Bury St Edmund's, March 10 at 11. Salmon, Bury St Edmund's.
Lagdel, John, Prisoner for Bobt, Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, John, Prisoner for Bobt, Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, John, Prisoner for Bobt, Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, John, Prisoner for Bobt, Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, John, Prisoner for Bobt, Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, John, Prisoner for Bobt, Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, Lohn, Prisoner for Bobt, Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, Lohn, Prisoner, Sun 2 de Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, Lohn, Prisoner, Sun 2 de Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, Lohn, Prisoner, Sun 2 de Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, Lohn, Prisoner, Sun 2 de Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, Lohn, Prisoner, Sun 2 de Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, Lohn, Prisoner, Sun 2 de Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdel, Lohn, Prisoner, Sun 2 de Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.
Lagdeld, Lohn, Prisoner, Sun 2 de Lancaster, Adj. Jun 18. Lynol.

Lagden, Robt, Bury St Edmund's, Sulfolk, out of business. Pet Feb 20. Bury St Edmund's, March 10 at 11. Salmon, Bury St Edmund's, Larch 10 at 11. Salmon, Bury St Edmund's, Larch 10 at 11. Salmon, Bury St Edmund's, Larch 14. Rogers, Bedford, Beer Retailer. Pet Feb 18. Bedford, March 7 at 11. Rogers, Bedford, March 19. Rogers, Bedford, March 19. Rogers, Bedford, March 19. Rogers, Bedford, March 11. Heathcote, Nottingham, March 29 at 11. Heathcote, Nottingham, March 29 at 11. Heathcote, Nottingham, Bristol, March 8 at 11. Clifton, & Beckingham, Bristol. Murphy, Chus Stanliedl, Lpool, Timber Dealer. Adj Feb 15. Lpool, March 8 at 3. Newton, Cyrus, Pamsey, Huntingdon, out of business. Pet Feb 18. Huntingdon, March 9 at 2. Gaches, Peterborough, Newton, Cyrus, Pamsey, Huntingdon, out of business. Pet Feb 18. Huntingdon, March 9 at 2. Gaches, Peterborough, Ogden, Sami, March, Woollen Cloth Dealer. Pet Feb 15. Manch, March 6 at 12. Gardner, March, March 10 at 11. Crubb, Rugeley. Parr, March, Yemple Cloud, Sumerset, Imskeeper. Pet Feb 14. Bristol, March 8 at 11. King & Plummer, Bristol.

Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 10 at 12. Moore, Sunderland. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 10 at 12. Moore, Sunderland. Pet Feb 21. Newcastle-upon-Tyne, March 10 at 12. Moore, Sunderland.

Newcastic-upon-tyne, Marca 10 at 12. Moore, Sunderland. Price, Wm Walter, Llandiloes, Mortgomery, Cattle Dealer. Pet Feb 21. Llandiloes, March 6 at 12. Jonkins, Llandiloes. Rae, Martin, Knoth Mill, Manch, Parafin Oil and Lamp Dealer. Pet Feb 11. Manch, March 9 at 12. Sale & Co. Manch. Rawlings, Hy, Weston-super-Marc, Somerset, Fishmonger. Pet Feb 20. Weston-super-Marc, March 10 at 11. Smith, Weston-super-March. Mare

Rhodes, Joseph, Manch, Shirt Manufacturer.
March 6 at 1. Gardner, Manch.
Royston, Wn Lemin, Flint, Medical Student.
March 10 at 1. Cartwright, Chester.
Sharp, Hy, Lichfield, Carrier. Pet Feb 18. Lichfield, March 3 at 10.
Wilson, Lichfield, Carrier.
Nort, Joseph, New Sleaford, Lincoln, Tailor. Pet Feb, 21. Sleaford, March 9 at 10. Foster & Rodgers, New Sleaford.
Skee, Wm, & Alex Dixon, South Shields, Durham, Shipowners.
Pet Feb 10. Newcaste-upon-Tyne, March 9 at 11.30. Leitch & Kewney, North Shields, Durham, Shipowners.
Field, March 6 at 11. Parrot & Co, Macclesfield, March 6 at 10. Parrot & Co, Macclesfield.
Spires, Thos, Smethwick, Stanford, Carpenter. Adj Dec 12. Oldbury, Feb 28 at 10. Rhodes, Joseph, Manch, Shirt Manufacturer. Pet Feb 21. Manch,

ren 28 at 10.

Steel, John, Leeds, York, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer. Pet Feb 14.
Leeds, March 8 at 11. Bond & Barwick, Leeds.

Taylor, Joseph, Prisoner for Debt, Lancaster. Adj Feb 15. Manch,
March 7 at 11.

March 7 at 11.

Usher, John, Lpool, Joiner. Pet Feb 18. Lpool, March 9 at 3. Black-hurst, Lpool.

Wenham, Wm, East Dereham, Norfolk, Commercial Traveller. Pet Feb 20. East Dereham, March 8 at 2. Sadd, jun, Norwich.

Whitehead, Philip, jun, Bardwell, Suffolk, Miller. Adj Feb 17. Bury St Edmund's, March 10 at 11.30.

Whurman, Simon Hy, Birm, Clothier. Pet Feb 13. Birm, March 8 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
Widdup, Richard, Birkdale. Lancaster, out of business. Pet Feb 20.
Lpool, March 6 at 12. Toulmin & Carruthers, Lpool.
Wide, James, Levenshume, Manch, Commercial Traveller. Pet Feb 21. Manch, March 13 at 9.30. Horner, Manch.
Wootton, Chas, Nottingham, Licensed Victualler. Adj Feb 21. Nottingham, March 28 at 11.

TUESDAY, Feb. 28, 1865.

To Surrender in London.

Allen, Benj, Milton-next-Gravesend, Licensed Waterman. Pet Feb 22.
March 14 at 1. Wilkinson & Co. Nicholas-lane.
Attwood, Wm Hy, Luton, Bedford, Builder. Pet Feb 23. March 14 at 2. Treherne & Wolferstan, Aldermanbury.
Bangs, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 21. March 13 at 1.
Aldridge.

Aldridge.

Banks, Hy, Prisoner for Debt, London. Pet Feb 22 (for pau.) March 14 at 1. Charlton, Chatham-pl, Blackfriars.

Bergman, Geo Elkin, Blackheath, Photographic Printer. Pet Feb 22. March 20 at 11. Feddell, Ironmonger-lane.

Boon, Geo, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 22. March 16 at 12. Buswell, Wm, and Robt Buswell, Rood-lane, Colonial Produce Merchants. Pet Feb 22. March 20 at 11. Moore, Mark-lane.

Clark, Chas, City-road, Engraver. Pet Feb 23. March 20 at 12. Wetherfield, Moorgate-st.

Connelly, Patrick Wm, St. James's-walk, Clerkenwell, Beerhouse-keeper. Adj Feb 17. March 20 at 12. East, John, Prisoner for Debt, Northampton. Adj Feb 18. Northampton, March 16 at 1. Ellis, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 21. March 13 at 1.

ton, March 10 as 1.

Ellis, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 21. March 13 at 1.
Aldridge.

Eva, John, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 18. March 16 at 1.

Fenn, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 22. March 16 at 1.

Fisher, Francis, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 22. March 13 at 1.

Fisher, Francis, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb. 17. March 16 at 1. Glover, Ann., Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 17. March 16 at 1. Goalen, Jas Wallace, Harrison-st, Gray's-inn-rd, Coal Dealer. Feb 18. March 20 at 1.

Harris, Chas, East-st, Walworth, Cab Driver. Pet Feb 24. March 16 at 12. Cooper, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Hartfield, Geo, Duncan-pl, Hackney, Oil and Colourman. Pet Feb 21. March 14 at 12. Drew, New Basinghall-st.

Isaac, Frdk, High-st. Deptford, Shipwright. Pet Feb 24. March 15 at 11. Heathfield, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Jones, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb. 22. March 13 at 1. Aldridge.

Jones, Wm. Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb. 22. March 13 at 1. Aldridge.

Nolan, Edwd Hy, Abingdon-villas, Kensington, Author. Pet Feb 25. March 15 at 12. Jones, New-inn, Strand.

Palmer, Jas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Feb 18. March 16 at 12.

Palmer, Wm Townshend, Addison-road, Notting-hill, Hair Cutter. Pet Feb 22. March 14 at 12. Munday, Essex-st, Strand.

Pooley, Richd, Brighton, Haberdasher, Pet Feb 24. March 20 at 1. Treherne, Aldermanbury.

Rayner, Wm, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 17. March 16 at 12.

Reed, Robt, Adelphi-ter, Adam-st, Strand, Surveyor. Pet Feb 24. March 15 at 11. Kent, Strand. Skitton, Stephen. Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 21. March 13

as 1. Mariage. Slater, Hy, Tottenham-ct-rd, Licensed Victualler. Adj Feb 18. March 20 at 1. Snowell, Jas, Broad-st, Golden-sq, Carpenter. Adj Feb 17. March 20

at 12.
Tarte, Wm, Tothill-st, Westminster, Lead Merchant. Pet Feb 23.
March 14 at 2. Harrison & Lewis, Old Jewry.
Taylor, Silas, Prisoner for Debt, London. Adj Feb 18. March 16 at 1.
Thomson, Patrick Johnson, Hampstead, Ship Broker. Pet Feb 23.
March 13 at 1. Philbrick, Basinghall-st.
Wakelin, Wm, St Albans, Brewer. Fet Feb 21. March 14 at 12. Cooper,
St Martiva, Language.

waxenn, wm, st Albans, Brewer. Fet Feb 21. March 14 at 12. Cooper, St Martin's-lane. Whitlaw, Herman Willem, Deal, Hotel Keeper. Pet Feb 21. March 15 at 2. Hall, Staple-inn. 16 at 2. Hall Staple-inn.
Wing, Susannah Betsy, Hoper's-rd, Southgate, out of business. Adj
Feb 17. March 20 at 1.

To Surrender in the Country.

To Surrender in the Country.

Archer, Saml, Yeaveley, Derby, Schoolmaster. Pet Feb 13 (for pau).
Derby, March 14 at 12. Smith, Derby.

Arden, John, Warmingham, Sandbach, Chester, Corn Miller. Pet
Feb 14. Lpool, March 9 at 12. Sheppard, Crewe.

Atkinson, David, Pontefract, York, out of business. Pet Feb 25.
Leeds, March 13 at 11. Harle, Leeds.
Attoe, John, Oid Catton, Norfolk, Lime Burner. Adj Feb 14 (for pau).
Norwich, March 13 at 11. Sadd, Norwich.
Ayton, John, Norwich, Baker. Pet Feb 24. Norwich, March 13 at 11.
Emerson, Norwich.
Bassenden, John Harry, Leicester, Refreshment-house Keeper. Pet
Feb 24. Leicester, March 15 at 10. Fetty, Leicester.
Bates, John Johnson Vernon, Breaston, Derby, Publican. Pet Feb
21. Derby, March 14 at 12. Briggs, Derby.
Baylis, Wm. Cheltenham, Gloucester, Fruiterer. Pet Feb 23. Cheltenham, March 14 at 11. Stroud, Cheltenham.
Bellerby, John, York, Hairdresser. Pet Feb 23. Leeds, March 13 at 11.
Young, York.
Beresford, Wm, Birm, Brush Maker. Pet Feb 23. Birm, March 20 at
10. Saygent, Birm.
Sind Simen, Blowwich, Stefford no business. Pet Feb 24. Weisell
Sind Simen, Blowwich, Stefford no business.

Beresford, Wm, Birm, Brush Maker. Pet Feb 23. Birm, Maren 20 at 10. Sargent, Birm.
Bird, Simeon, Bloxwich, Stafford, no business. Pet Feb 24. Walsall, March 14 at 12. Duignan & Co, Walsall.
Blackborow, John, Christchurch, Monmouth, Clerk to a Railway Carrier, Pet Feb 23. Newport, March 8 at 11. Hall, Newport.
Burgess, Chas, Stoke-upon-Trent, Butty Collier. Pet Feb 24. Stoke-upon-Trent, March 18 at 11. Lees, Burslem.
Butterworth, Jas, Crompton, Lancaster, Tin Plate Worker. Pet Feb 24. Oldham, March 16 at 12. Taylor, Oldham.
Carter, Geo Chas, Ashe, Sarrey, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 21. Farnham, March 8 at 12. White, Guildford.

Chambers, Jas Alex, Prisoner for Debt, Nottingham. Adj Feb 21.
Nottingham, March 14 at 12.
Childs, Walter, Heath, Worcester, Ironmonger's Assistant. Pet Feb 24.
Stourbridge, March 29 at 10. Heckford, Kidderminster.
Clarke, Joseph, Beeston-hill, Leeds, Oil Merchaut. Pet Feb 20. Leeds,
March 13 at 11. Simpson, Leeds.
Clayton, Thos Lucas, Leighton Buzzard, Bedford, Corn Dealer. Adj
Feb 22. Bedford, March 15 at 11. Conquest & Stimson, Bedford.
Cole, Chas, Trotton, Sussex, Farmer. Pet Feb 23. Midhurst, March
13 at 2. Soames, Fetersfield.
Cox, Wm., Hacconby, Lincoln, General-shop Keeper. Pet Feb 24.
Bourn, March 14 at 2. Law, Stamford.
Denham, John Hy, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Carpenter. Pet Feb 24.
Bourn, March 14 at 11. Joyce, Newport.
Edwards, Thos, Stoke-upon-Trent, Clothier. Pet Feb 24. Stokeupon-Trent, March 18 at 11. Lees, Burslem.
Elm, Chas, Barrow-upon-Humber, Labourer. Pet Feb 22. Bartonon-Humber, March 29 at 11. Mason, Barton.
Few, Geo, Swavesey, Cambridge, Shoemaker. Pet Feb 23. Huntingdon, March 14 at 12. Hunt, Cambridge.
Gooday, Augustus Fred, Newcastle, Stafford, Physician. Pet Feb 27.
Birm, March 17 at 12. Hodgson & Son, Birmingham.
Halket, Thos Herbert, Lpool, Bookkeeper. Pet Feb 25. Nottingham,
March 29 at 11. Heathcote, Nottingham.
March 29 at 11. Heathcote, Nottingham.
March 29 at 11. Heathcote, Nottingham.
March 29 at 11. Smith, Derby,
March 14 at 12. Smith, Derby,
March 14 at 12. Smith, Derby,
March 15 at 19. Solossop, Derby, Groeer. Pet Feb 21 (for pau).
Birm, March 17 at 12. Hough Manufacturers. Pet Feb 22. Leeds, March 13 at 11. Booth, Holmfirth, and Bond & Barviek, Leeds.
Hodgson, Richd Chas, Birm, General Agent. Pet Feb 21 (for pau).
Birm, March 17 at 12. Hough Manufacturer. Pet Feb
25. Treston, March 18 at 10. Edelston, Preston.

Hodgson, Richd Chas, Birm, General Agent. Pet Feb 21 (for pau).
Birm, March 17 at 12.
Houlding, Wm, Preston, Laneaster, Cut Nail Manufacturer. Pet Feb
25. Preston, March 18 at 10. Edelston, Preston.
Houseroft, Jas, Adwalton, nr Leeds, Joiner. Pet Feb 24. Leeds, March
13 at 11. Harle, Leeds.
Jones, John, Banbury, Oxford, Brazier. Pet Feb 22. Banbury, March
9 at 10. Pellatt, Banbury,
Judd, Albert, Mew, Portsen, Hants, Licensed Victualler. Pet Feb 24.
Portsmouth, March 18 at 11. White, Portsen.
Juler, Geo, Burnham Westgate, Norfolk, Watchmaker. Pet Feb 21.
Little Walsingham, March 16 at 3. Garwood, Jun, Wells-next-the-Sea.
King, Joseph Berry, Prisoner for Debt, Warwick. Adj Feb 22. Birm,
March 15 at 12. James & Griffin, Birm.
Lewin, Thos, Tranmere, Chester, Bockkeeper. Pet Feb 23. Birken-head, March 14 at 10. Wynne, Lpool.
Longland, Eli, Isham, Wellingborough, Northampton, Butcher. Pet
Feb 23. Wellingborough, March at 11. Cook, Wellingborough,
Loudon, Jas, West Cowes, Isle of Wight, Outfitter. Pet Feb 23. Newport, March 11 at 11.30. Joyce, Newport.
Lowe, David, Moxley, Stafford, Beerhouse-keeper. Pet Feb 6. Derby,
March 14 at 12. Briggs, Derby.
March 13 at 9.30. Gardner, Manch.
Mason, Edwd, Welverhampton, Grocer. Pet Feb 23. Wolverhampton,
Match 7 at 12. Barlett, Wolverhampton,
Matthews, John Alex, Monkwearmouth, Durham, Brassfounder, Adj
Feb 15. Sunderland, March 15 at 12. Lisle, Durham.

March 15 at 9.30. Gardner, Manch.
Mason, Edwd, Wolverhampton, Grocer. Pet Feb 23. Wolverhampton,
Masch, Edwd, Wolverhampton, Grocer.
Matthews, John Alex, Monkwearmouth, Durham, Brassfounder, Adj
Feb 15. Sunderland, March 15 at 12. Lisle, Durham.
Milligan, John, Southampton, Painter. Pet Feb 23. Southampton,
March 18 at 12. Mackey, Southampton.
Moore, Alfred, Sawston, Cambridge, Butcher. Pet Feb 24. Cambridge,
March 10 at 1. Hunt, Cambridge, Butcher. Pet Feb 24. Cambridge,
March 10 at 1. Hunt, Cambridge, Butcher. Pet Feb 27. DorGrocer, March 13 at 2. Weston, Dorchester.
Faine, Thos, Piddletown, Dorset, Harness Maker. Pet Feb 27. Dorchester, March 13 at 2. Weston, Dorchester.
Poole, John, Wellington, Salop, Blacksmith. Pet Feb 23. Wellington,
March 14 at 10. James, Wellington.
Palmer, John Wells, Worcester, Law Clerk. Pet Feb 24. Worcester,
March 14 at 11. Wilson, Worcester.
Cuarmby, Jos Lockwood, Ashton-under-Lyne, Medical Student. Pet
Feb 23. Ashton-under-Lyne, March 23 at 12. Taylor, Oldham.
Rawlins, David Archibald Dixon, Market Harborough, Attorney,
Pet Feb 24. Birn, March 15 at 12. James & Griffin, Birmingham.
Roberts, Mary, Newcastle-under-Lyne, Widow. Adj Feb 14. Newcastle-under-Lyme, March 15 at 12. James & Griffin, Birmingham.
Roberts, Mary, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Widow. Adj Feb 14. Newcastle-under-Lyme, March 15 at 16. Lichfield.
Robinson, Mathtew. Radford, Nottingham, Lace Maker. Pet Feb 24.
Birm, March 16 at 11. Heath, Nottingham, Lace Maker. Pet Feb 24.
Birm, March 15 at 12. East, Birm,
March 16 at 11. Shorter, Hastings,
March 17 at 12. East, Birm.
Samel, Pinkus, Fortsea, Hants, Dealer in Jewellery. Pet Feb 24.
Fortsmonth, March is at 11. White, Fortsea.
Stevens, Richd Hy, Truro, Cornwall, Dealer in Jee Ebs. Gloucester, March
17 at 12. Wilkes, Gloucester.
The Feb 25. Gloucester, March
17 at 12. Wilkes, Gloucester.

Stevens, Richd Hy, Truro, Cornwall, Dealer in Ale. Pet Feb 25. Truro, March 15at 3. Marchall, Truro. Taylor, Danl, Gloucester, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 25. Gloucester, March

Taylor, Danl, Gloucester, Innkeeper. Pet Feb 25. Gloucester, March 17 at 12. Wilkes, Gloucester.
 Thomas, Alfred, Perranarworthal, Cornwall, Ironfounder. Pet Feb 23. Falmouth, March 3 at 11. Jenkins, Penryn.
 Walker, Win Spencer, Knarosborough, York, Inspector of Railways. Pet Feb 22. Knarosborough, March 10. Bichardson.
 Wilkinson, Thos, Lpool, Machine Fitter. Pet Feb 22. Lpool, March 14 at 11. Goldrick, Lpool.
 Williams, John Hy, Lpool. Ship Broker. Pet Feb 24. Lpool, March 11 at 11. Gregory, Lpool.
 Winfield, Jossiah, & John Smith, Manch, Plumbers. Pet Feb 23. Manch, March 13 at 9.30. Gardner, Manch.
 Wight, Geo, Follifot, Harrogate, York, Farm Labourer. Pet Feb 23. Knaresborough, March 15 at 10. Harle, Leeds.

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

Collard, Albert John, Flete Farm, nr Margate, Kent, Farmer. Feb 17. Rotherham, Caleb Chas, Grassendale, Aighburgh, nr Lpool, Insurance Broker. Feb 18.

OUNTY FIRE OFFICE, No. 50, REGENT-STREET, and No. 14, CORNHILL, LONDON. ESTABLISHED 1806.

Returns paid to Insured. £287,223. Claims paid since the Establishment of the Office, £1,346,975.

The Hon. Arthur Kinnaird, M.P.
Sir Richard D. King, Bart.
Sir G. E. Welby Gregory, Bart.
Sir G. E. Welby Gregory, Bart.
Sir G. E. Welby Gregory, Bart.
The Rates of Fremium charged by the County Fire Office are upon the owest scale consistent with security to the Insured.
All Losses are settled with prompittude and liberality.
When a Policy has existed Seven Fears, a RETURN of 25 per cent. on one-fourth of the Fremiums paid, is declared upon such of 261cies.
The Return thus paid at the present time amount to £267,423. The following Table contains the Names of some of the Policy Holders who have participated in these Returns:—

who have participated in these Returns :-

Policy No.	Name and Residence of Insured.			Bonus.		
		£	8.	d		
138,142	W. F. Riley, Esq	464	1	0		
156,308	Messrs. Broadwood, Golden-square	169	7	9		
114,163	W. T. Copeland, Esq., New Bond-street	83	2	•		
156,784	Major-General Vyse, Stoke-place, Slough	70	14	16		
143,872	Peter Thompson, Esq., Frith-street, Soho	63	9	-		
99.218	Sir James J. Hamilton, Bart., Portman-square	63	0	-		
139,634	John Amor, Esq., New Bond-street		14	(
69,699	Lady Jane Rodd, Wimpole-street	47	0	i		
257,954	The Rt. Hon. Earl Howe, Gopsall Hall, Leices-		-			
	tershire	40	15	-		
49,024	The Rev. C. Barter, Sarsden, Oxon	39	5	:		
350,497	J. H. Hamilton, Esq. M.P., Abbotstown, Dublin	29	17	4		
81,118	Edward Thornton, Esq., Princes-street, Han-		- •			
	over-square	28	14	(

CHARLES STEVENS, Secretary,

Commission.—The usual Commission of 5 per cent, upon New Policies and Renewals, is allowed to Solicitors and other Professional Gentlemen introducing business to the County Fire Office

PROVIDENT LIFE OFFICE, No. 50, REGENT-STREET, LONDON, W.

ESTABLISHED 1806.

Policy Holders' Capital, £1,566,148. Annual Income, £195,301, Bonusses Declared, £1,451,157. Claims Paid since the Establishment of the Office, £3,456,947.

President,-THE RIGHT HONOUBABLE EARL GREY. Chairman of Directors .- THE HON. ARTHUR KINNAIRD, M.P. Deputy Chairman .- George Dacke, Esq. Managing Director. - John A. BEAUMONT, Esq.

The Profits (subject to a trifling deduction) are divided among the Insured.

Examples of Bonnses added to Policies issued by THE PROVIDENT LIFE OFFICE.

No. of Policy.	Date of Policy.	Annual Premium	Sum Insured.	Amount with Bonus additions.		
		£ 8. d		£ s. d.		
4,718	1823	194 15 10	5,000	10,632 14 2		
3,924	1821	165 4	5,000	10,164 19 0		
4.937	1824	205 13	4,000	9,637 2 2		
2,946	1818	184 7	5,000	9,254 13 5		
5,795	1825	157 1	5,000	9,253 5 10		
2.027	1816	122 13	4.000	8,576 11 2		
3,944	1821	49 15 1	1,000	2,498 7 6		
788	1808	29 18	1,000	2,327 13 5		

JOHN HODDINOTT, Secretary.

Mission.—The usual Professional Commission of 10 per Cent. upon the First Premium, and 5 per Cent. upon Renewals, is allowed to So-licitors and others, and continued to be paid to the party introducing

In 1 vol. large 8vo, price 34s., the Second Edition of WRONGS AND THEIR REMEDIES: being a Treatise on the Law of Torts. By C. G. ADDISON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Author of the "Law of Contracts." London: STEVENS, SONS, & HAYNES, Bell-yard, Lincoln's-inn.

This day is published,
DODD AND BROOKE'S PRACTICE OF THE COURT OF PROBATE.
In 8vo., price £1 11s. 5d., cloth,
THE LAW and PRACTICE of the COURT of

PROBATE, Contentious and Common Form. With the Rales, Statutes, and Forms. By PHILIP WM. DODD, Solicitor, and G EORGE HENRY RROOKE, Doctors'-commons.

STEVENS, SONS, & HAYNES, 26, Bell-yard, Lincoln's-inn.

This day is published,
CHANCERY COSTS,
In Strong, In Strong, In CHANCERY.

A TREATISE on COSTS in CHANCERY. By
GEORGE OSBORNE MORGAN, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, and
late Fellow of University College, Oxford, and Eldon Scholar. With an
Appendix, containing Forms and Precedents of Bills of Costs. By J. A.
STOKES, Esq., of the Taxing Master's Office.

Skevens, Sons, & Hannes, 26, Bell-yard, Lincoln's-inn.

This day is published,
TILSLEY'S STAMP ACTS.
In 8vo., price 12s. 6d., cloth,
DIGEST of the STAMP ACTS, and the JUDICIAL DECISIONS on the STAMP LAWS, not contained in the
Author's Treatise; including the Probate, Legacy, and Succession Duties;
with Tables of all the Stamp Duties. By HUGH TILSLEY, Assistant
Solicitor of Inland Revenue. Ninth Edition, revised by his son, EDWARD
HUGH TILSLEY, of the Inland Revenue Office.
STEVENS, SONS, & HAYNES, 26, Bell yard, Lincoln's-inn.

Just published, 12s., cloth,

AYNES OUTLINES OF EQUITY, Second

Edition. Outlines of Equity, being a series of Elementary Lectures on Equity Jurisdiction, delivered at the request of the Incorporated
Law Society, with Suplementary Lectures on certain Doctrines of
Equity. By FREEMAN OLIVER HAYNES, of Lincoln's-lim, Barristerat-Law, and late Fellow of Caius' College, Cambridge.

Ws. MARWELL, 32, Bell-yard, Lincoln's-lim.

SLACK'S SILVER ELECTRO PLATE is a coating of pure Silver over Nickell Annual Plate is a coating of pure Silver over Nickel. A combination of two metals pos-sing such valuable properties renders it in appearance and wear equal Thread, £ s. d. 2 8 0 1 15 0 Tea Spoons 0 12 0 and 0 18 0 1 3 6 1 11

Every Article for the Table as in Silver. A Sample Tea Spoon warded on receipt of 20 stamps.

BROOKS & SCHALLER (removed from Piccadilly). — The INDEX, printed MONTHLY (first published in 1820), of ESTATES, Country and Town Houses, Manors, Hunting Quarters, Shootings and Fishings, Farms, &c., to be LET or SOLD, can be had (free) at their Offices, 25, Charles-street, St. James's, S.W., opposite the Junior United Service Club. Particulars inserted without charge, but for next publication must be forwarded before the 28th of each month.

WANTED, a HOUSE, with 7 or 8 rooms, suitable for Offices, for a Religious Society. The neighbourhood of Holborn-hill or Lincoln's-inn-fields preferred.—Address to YATES & ALEXANDER, Printers, Church-passage, Chancery-lane.

THAMBERS TO BE LET, at the head of Chan-Cery-lane, in Holborn, comprising four elegant and commodious apartments, with W.C., &c.—Apply to ALEX. KIRKLAND, Estate Agent, 3, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn.

TO SOLICITORS, &c., requiring DEED BOXES, will find the best-made article lower than any other house. Lists of Prices and sizes may be had gratis or sent post free.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, Strand, opposite Som erset House Established nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 sent carriag

SLACK'S FENDER AND FIRE-IRON WAREHOUSE is the MOST ECONOMICAL, consistent with good quality:—
Iron Fenders, 3s.6d.; Bronzed ditto, 8s. 6d., with standards; superior
Drawing-room ditto, 18s. 6d. to 50s.; Fire Irons, 2s. 6d. to 29s. Patent
Dish Covers, with handles to take off, 18s. set of six. Table Knives and
Forks, 8s. per dozen. Roasting Jacks, complete, 7s. 6d. Tea-trays,
6s. 6d. set of three; elegant Papier Maché ditto, 25s. the set. Teapots,
with plated knob, 5s. 6d.; Coal Scuttles, 2s. 6d. A set of Kitchen Utensils for cottage, £3. Slack's Cutlery has been celebrated for 50 years.
Iroyy Table Knives, 14s., 16s., and 18s. per dozen. White Bone Knives
and Forks, 8s. 9d. and 12s.; Black Horn ditto, 8s. and 10s. All warranted.

As the limits of an advertisement will not allow of a detailed list, purchasers are requested to send for their Catalogue, with 350 drawings, and prices of Electro-Piate, Warranted Table Gutlery, Furnishing Iromonagery, &c. May be had gratis or post free. Every article marked in plain figures at the same low prices for which their establishment has been celebrated for nearly 50 years. Orders above £2 delivered carriage free per rail.

RICHARD & JOHN SLACK, 336, STRAND, LONDON, Opposite Somerset House.

Just published, price Is., post free, forming a Supplement to Mr. Miller's

THE GENERAL RULES and ORDERS of the OFFICE OF LAND REGISTRY.

Price 2s. 6d.: with the Rules 3s., post free,

THE ACT to FACILITATE the PROOF of
TITLE to, and the CONVEYANCE of REAL ESTATES. With
PRACTICAL NOTES and INDEX. By ALEXANDER E. MILLER, Barrister-at-Law. Office of "Solicitors' Journal" and "Weekly Reporter," Carey-street,

DEBENTURES at 61, 61, and 63 per CENT.
Capital (fully subscribed), £1,000,000 in 20,000 Shares of £50 each.
Paid up £15,000.

DIRECTORS

L. Balfour, Esq.
H. D. Cartwright, Esq.
J. Layton, Esq.
J. Layton, Esq.
W. Moran, Esq.
G. F. Rimington, Esq.
Bankers.—Agra & Mascerman's Bank, Limited.
Solicitors.—Messrs, Uptons, Johnson & Upton.
The Directors of this Association, the principal operations of which are those of a Land Credit Company for India, are prepared to receive Subscriptions for an issue of Debentures for £150,000, bearing Interest as follows:

ments.

The accruing interest will be paid half-yearly at the Company's Bankers, by Coupons attached to the Debentures. Applications for Debentures and other information to be made at the Offices of the Company, 7. East India Avenue, Leadenhall-street, where all further information may be obtained.

DEBENTURES at 5, 51, and 6 per CENT.—

Subscribed Capital, £500,000.

Subscribed Capital, £300,000.

Directorias.

Major-Gen. Henry Pelham Burn.
Harry George Gordon, Esq.
George Ireland, Esq.
Manager-C. J. Brank, Esq.

Duncan James Kay, Esq. Stephen P. Kennard, Esq. Patrick F. Robertson, Esq. Robert Smith, Esq.

Manager—C. J. Brane, Esq.

The Directors are prepared to ISSUE DEBENTURES for one, three, and five years, at 5, 5½, and 6 per Cent. respectively.

They are also prepared to invest Money on Mortgage in Ceylon and Mauritius, either with or without the guarantee of the Company, as may

be arranged.

Applications for particulars to be made at the office of the company,

No. 12, Leadenhall-street, London.—By order, JOHN ANDERSON, Secretary

SEVEN per CENT. GUARANTEED on MONEY Invested, in first registered Mortgages, through the medium of the TRUST AND AGENCY COMPANY OF AUSTRALASIA (Limited).

DIRECTORS.

William Frederick Baring, Esq.
F. A. Bevan, Esq. (Messrs. Barciay, Bevan, Tritton, Twells, & Co.).
Andrew Bonar, Esq., Penbridge-square.
W. W. Cargill, Esq., M.P., Connaught-place West, Hyde-park.
Alfred Denison, Esq., Albemarle-street,
Henry Kingscote, Esq., Eaton-place.
Hon. Arthur Kinnaird, M. P. (Messrs. Ransom, Bouverie, & Co.).
Henry Loftus Wigram, Esq., Grosvenor-square.

Offices, 31, St. Swithin's-lane, London, E.C.

The Company, as agents, effect investments in first registered mort-gages in Australia and New Zealand, to pay investors seven per cent. per annum, the interest being guaranteed and paid half-yearly by the Com-

pany.

The Company also issue Five per Cent, Debentures for loans for three or more years. The debentures, besides being secured by the paid-up capital and property under mortcage to the Company, have, in addition, the guarantee of uncalled proprietary capital sufficient alone to liquidate in full the whole of the debentures that may be issued; and further, in order that the debenture-holders should be most amply protected, it is expressly provided by the Company's constitution that the D rectors may borrow only to the extent of the uncalled subscribed share capital.

Full particulars on application to the understoned.

Full particulars on application to the undersigned. JAMES HORA, General Manager, By order.

NEW ZEALAND TRUST AND LOAN COM-

PANY (LIMITED).
Subscribed Capital, £500,600.

TRUSTRES.
M.P. | G. Grenfell Glyn, Esq., M.P.
J. J. Cummins, Esq. Robert Brooks, Esq., M.P. DIRECTORS.

Sir Charles Clifford. F. G. Dalgety, Esq. R. A. Brooks, Esq.

Captn. H. Carr Glyn, R.N. H. Selfe Selfe, Esq. G. Fenning, Esq. BANKERS.-Messrs, Glyn, Mills, Currie, & Co.

The Directors continue to issue Debentures of £100 and upwards for periods of three to seven years, interest on which is payable half-yearly, at their Bankers, by Coupon.

The amount of these Debentures is limited and secured by the uncalled balance of the subscribed Capital of the Company, which must always be of an equivalent or greater amount.

They will form a first charge upon real and other property in New Zealand, on which it is the business of the Company to grant loans by war of mortcage.

way of mortgage.

Further particulars may be obtained and application made at the Offices of the Company.

By order of the Board, THOS. D. SAUNDERS, Secretary. 31, New Broad-street, London, E.C.

AW UNION FIRE and LIFE INSURANCE

COMPANY. Chief Offices-126, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.

Subscribed Capital—ONE MILLION STERLING.
The Fire and Life Departments are under one management, separate Funds and Accounts.

Chairman—Sir WILLIAM FOSTER. Bart. Deputy-Chairman—Mr. Serjeant MANNING, Q.A.S.

Deputy-Chairman—1. Secretal Hardshow, C.S.S.
FIRE DEPARTMENT.
Capital £750,000, in addition to the Reserve Fund.
Business consists of the best classes of risks.
Insurants will be allowed the full benefit of the Reduction of Duty.
Claims settled promptly and liberally.

LIFE DEPARTMENT.
Capital £250,000, in addition to the Reserve Fund.

PREMIUMS MODERATE.

A Bonus every five years. Next Bonus in 1869. At the Division of Profits in 1864, the Reversionary Bonus amounted to from 15 to 50 per cent, per annum on the Premium paid, varying with the ages of the

sured.

Copies of the Directors' Report and Balance-sheet, and every informam, may be obtained at the Chief Office, or of any of the Agents of the
mpany.

FRANK McGEDY, Secretary.

CLERICAL, MEDICAL, AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY. 13, ST. JAMES'S-SQUARE, LONDON, S.W.

ESTABLISHED 1824.

President.—The Archbishop of Canterbury.
Chairman.—Right Hon, John Robert Mowbray, M.P.
Deputy-Chairmen. { William Bowman, Esq., F.R.S.
Sir Charles Locox, Bart., F.R.S.

The following are among the distinctive features of the Society The following are among the distinctive readures of the Society:

CREDIT STREEM.—On any Policy for the whole of Life, where the age
does not exceed 60, one half of the Annual Premiums during the first
five years may remain on credit, and may either continue as a debt on
the Policy, or be paid off at any time.
Low Rates or Pramium for Young Lives, with early participation

in Pronts.

Endowment Assumances may be effected, without Profits, by which the Sum Assured becomes payable on the attainment of a specified age, or at death, whichever event shall first happen.

INVALID LIVER may be assured at rates proportioned to the increased

PROMPT SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS .- Claims paid thirty days after proof of death.

The Reversionary Bonus at the Quinquennial Division in 1862 averaged 48 per Cent., and the Cash Bonus 28 per Cent., on the Premiums paid in

the 5 years.

The next Division of Profits will take place in January, 1867, and persons who effect New Polices before the end of June next will be entitled at that Division to one year's additional share of Profits over

later Entrants.

Tables of Rates and Forms of Proposal can be obtained of GEORGE CUTCLIFFE, Actuary and Secretary.

13, St. James's-square, London, S.W.

COMMISSION.

10 per Cent. on the First Premium, and 5 per Cent. on Renewals, is allowed to Solicitors. The Commission will be continued to the person introducing the Assurance, without reference to the channel through which the Premiums may be paid.

BRITON MEDICAL and GENERAL LIFE

Unices, 429, Strand, London.

Chairman of the Board—GEORGE H. BARLOW, M.D.
Deputy-Chairman—FRANCIS WEBB, Esq.
Annual Income, £130,600, increasing yearly at the rate of £20,000.
By the peculiarly equitable manner of dividing the profits, the Policies issued by this Association become payable during the lifetime of the person assured without extra premium. After having been in force a period of five years, all policies are absolutely indefeasible and indisputable.

Large and increasing bonuses.

LOANS

LOANS.

Loans granted on Mortgage of Real Estate, Reversions, Life Interests and upon Personal Security in connection with Life Assurance.

Proposal forms with detailed prospectuses and every information may be had on application to

JOHN MESSENT, Actuary and Secretary.
The usual Commission allowed Solicitors.

ANNUITIES AND REVERSIONS. AW REVERSIONARY INTEREST SOCIETY, 68, Chancery-lane, London.

AIRMAN—Russell Gurney, Esq., Q.C., Recorder of London. Deputy-Chairman—Sir W. J. Alexander, Bart., Q.C.

DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN—SIF W. J. Alexander, Bart, Q.C.
Reversions and Life Interests purchased. Immediate and Deferred Annuities granted in exchange for Reversionary and Contingent Interests.

Loans may also be obtained on the security of Reversions.

Annuities, Immediate, Deferred, and Contingent, and also Endowments, granted on favourable terms.

Prospectuses and Forms of Proposal, and all further information, may be had at the office.

C. B. CLABON, Sec.

Gouity and Law Tife Assurance Society,

18. LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

Capital, ONE MILLION, fully Subscribed by upwards of Two Hundred Members of the Legal Profession, a list of whom may be obtained on application at the Office.

TRUSTEES.

THE RIGHT HON, LORD CRANWORTH. THE RIGHT HON, LORD MONTEAGLE, THE RIGHT HON. THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE ERLE. THE RIGHT HON. THE LORD CHIEF BARON. THE RIGHT HON. SIR JOHN TAYLOR COLERIDGE. CHARLES PURTON COOPER, Esq., Q.C., LL.D., F.R.S. GEORGE CAPRON, Esq.

DIRECTORS.

CHAIRMAN-GEORGE LAKE RUSSELL, Esq., Lincoln's-inn. DEPUTY-CHAIRMAN-JOHN MOXON CLABON, Esq (Fearon, Clabon, & Fearon), 21, Great George-street. JOHN EDWARD ARMSTRONG, Esq., Middle Temple. HENRY WM. BIRCH, Esq. (Birch & Ingram), 68, Lincoln's-inn-fields. HENRY FOX BRISTOWE, Esq., Lincoln's-inn. R. J. P. BROUGHTON, Esq. (White, Broughton, & White), 12, Great Marlborough-street. ANTHONY CLEASBY, Esq., Q.C., Inner Temple. JOHN ELLIS CLOWES, Esq. (Clowes & Hickley), 10, King's Bench-walk, Temple. CHARLES J. DIMOND, Esq. (Simpson & Dimond), 10, Henrietta-street, Cavendish-square. SIMON DUNNING, Esq. (Burder & Dunning), 27, Parliament-street. JOHN W. HAWKINS, Esq., Chief Clerk to the Master of the Rolls. WILLIAM E. HILLIARD, Esq., Gray's-inn. N. HOLLINGSWORTH, Esq. (Hollingsworth, Tyerman, & Green), 24, Gresham-street. THOMAS HUGHES, Esq., Inner Temple JOHN ILIFFE, Esq. (Hiffe, Russell, & Hiffe), 2, Bedford-row.
THOMAS GLOVER KENSIT, Esq., Clerk to Skinners' Company, Dowgate-hill. CHARLES HENRY MOORE, Esq., 7, Lincoln's-inn-fields. EDMUND F. MOORE, Esq., Middle Temple. WILLIAM BENFORD NELSON, Esq. (Park & W. B. Nelson), 11, Essex-street, Strand. FREDERICK PEAKE, Esq. (Barker, Bowker, & Peake), 1, Gray's-inn-square. SIR ROBERT J. PHILLIMORE, Esq., Q.C., The Queen's Advocate. GEORGE W. K. POTTER, Esq., Secondary of London. W. B. S. RACKHAM, Esq., 46, Lincoln's-inn-fields. GEORGE ROBINS, Esq. (Warry, Robins, & Burges), 70, Lincoln's-inn-fields. ALFRED H. SHADWELL, Esq., Taxing Master in Chancery. RICHARD SMITH, Esq. (Richard & W. B. Smith), 7, New-square, Lincoln's-inn.

AUDITORS.

ELECTED BY THE PROPRIETORS. 1

JOHN BOODLE, Esq., 59, Chancery-lane.

ELLIS CLOWES, Esq., Secretary of the Alliance Bank.

ELECTED BY THE ASSURED.

JOHN C. TEMPLER, Esq., Master of the Court of Exchequer. A. H. BAILEY, Esq., Actuary to the London Assurance Corporation.

SOLICITOR.

GEORGE ROOPER, Esq., 26, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

MEDICAL OFFICER.

W. O. MARKHAM, M.D., 3, Harley-street.

ACTUARY AND SECRETARY.

THOMAS BOND SPRAGUE, Esq., M.A., formerley Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge.

The progress of the Society during the last Five Years is shown in the following Table :-

Year.	New Premiums. Renewal Premiums.		Total Income.	Claims.	Excess of Income over Expenditure.	
1860	£ 7,407	£ 40,950	£ 60,148	£ 16,540	£ 18,606	
1861	6,685	45,371	64,191	9,562	34,846	
1862	7,225	50,894	72,383	10,070	41,445	
1863	9,100	53,490	78,595	11,548	45,864	
1864	10,666	59,155	93,369	23,004	47,321	

LOANS granted on the Society's Policies, on Reversions, Life Interests, and other approved security. The Annual Reports and full Statements of Account are regularly printed, and may be obtained on application to the Secretary.

T. B. SPRAGUE, Actuary and Secretary.